

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

AUG 17 1953

VOL. LXXIV, 3

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

WHOLE No. 295

AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

HENRY T. ROWELL

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN, KEMP MALONE
BENJAMIN D. MERITT, JAMES H. OLIVER

EVELYN H. CLIFT: Secretary

Honorary Editor
DAVID M. ROBINSON

JULY, 1953

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
On the Importance of Land Tenure and Agrarian Taxation in the Byzantine Empire, from the Fourth Century to the Fourth Crusade. By KENNETH M. SETTON, - - - - -	225
Discolor Aura. Reflections on the Golden Bough. By ROBERT A. BROOKS, - - - - -	260
Aristotle, <i>Rhetic</i> , III, 16, 11 (1417 b 12-20). By L. A. MACKAY, - - - - -	281
A Non-Latin Italic and Cornish Parallel? By LOUIS H. GRAY, - - - - -	286
REVIEWS: - - - - -	288
Jacoby's <i>Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker</i> . Dritter Teil. Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie), B: Autoren über einzelne Städte (Laender), Nr. 297-607 (HERBERT BLOCH).—Jacoby's <i>Aththis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens</i> (HERBERT BLOCH).—Lasserre's <i>Les Épodes d'Archiloque</i> (FRANZ STOESSL).—Hérodote, <i>Histoires</i> , Livre VII. Texte établi et traduit par Ph.-E. Legrand (LIONEL PEARSON).—Demougeot's <i>De l'unité à la division de l'Empire Romain</i> , 395-410. Essai sur le gouvernement impérial (LUDWIG BIELEK).—Yale Classical Studies, XII (W. C. HELMBOLD).—Braga's <i>Catullo e i poeti greci</i> (J. P. ELDER).—Roberts' <i>The Antinoopolis Papryi</i> , Part I (J. F. GILLIAM).—Beazley's <i>The Development of Attic Black-figure</i> (EUGENE VANDERPOOL).—Goessler's <i>Wilhelm Dörpfeld. Ein Leben in Dienst der Antike</i> (MARGARETE BIEBER).—Ernout and Meillet's <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots</i> . Troisième édition, revue, corrigée et augmentée d'un index (JAMES W. POULTNEY).—Snell's <i>Der Aufbau der Sprache</i> (JOSHUA WHATMOUGH).—Webster's <i>Greek Terracottas</i> (DAVID M. ROBINSON).—Sutherland's <i>Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy</i> , 31 B. C.—A. D. 68 (ALFRED R. BELLINGER).	
BOOKS RECEIVED: - - - - -	332

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$6.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 50 cents, Canadian postage 25 cents, extra); single numbers, \$2.00 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Henry T. Rowell, The Johns Hopkins University; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore,
Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXXIV, 3

WHOLE No. 295

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF LAND TENURE AND AGRARIAN TAXATION IN THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE, FROM THE FOURTH CENTURY TO THE FOURTH CRUSADE.

The present study will be concerned with some important matters relating to the agrarian history of Byzantium, with especial reference to the economic and social condition of those who tilled the soil, the internal security of the state, and the problem of military defense. We shall go from the fourth century to the beginning of the thirteenth, i. e. from the founding of Constantinople, on the site of the ancient city of Byzantium, to the fall of that "God-guarded" city to the Fourth Crusaders in 1204. This is, of course, the great period of Byzantine history. Our attention will be given to the taxes on land and their collection, to certain forms of land tenure, to some economic and social institutions arising therefrom, and to the struggles of the imperial government to protect small landowners against the rapacity of the rich and the oppression of the powerful. Professor Georg Ostrogorsky has recently made the categorical statement that "the course taken by Byzantine agrarian history provides at every stage the key to the understanding of the whole historical evolution of Byzantium: just as the power and the internal stability of the Byzantine Empire in its best days were based on sound agrarian conditions, so its downfall was in great measure determined by the less happy course of its subsequent

agrarian history.”¹ Our purpose here will be some further demonstration of the general decline exhibited throughout this “less happy course,” and we shall note also some ways in which, owing largely to this decline in Byzantine agrarian economy, the social organization of the Eastern Empire came to resemble that of western Europe, a development which helped prepare the way for the easy settlement of the Fourth Crusaders upon the new lands which they conquered in continental Greece and the Morea, where they founded states which were, in some cases, to endure for more than two centuries and a half.

Although we shall deal, by and large, with the Byzantine Empire as a whole, we shall omit Egypt, which is pretty much a subject by itself, and which was in any event lost to Byzantium at the beginning of the fifth decade of the seventh century;² within the Byzantine Empire itself, our focus will, occasionally, include no wider areas than Attica and Boeotia, because of their intrinsic interest, because of the representative character of certain Athenian ecclesiastical documents, and because the material from which this paper is being written was gathered for the purpose of a book, now rather long in the process of construction, on *Athens in the Middle Ages*.

In the history of the later Roman Empire few topics are more familiar to us, in a superficial way, than the general administrative reform of Diocletian (284-305); part of this reform was a reorganization of the taxes on the land and its cultivators. The details of his system remain obscure, and have proved a fertile field for scholarly discussion and controversy. For purposes of taxation, land was divided, throughout the Empire,

¹ Georg Ostrogorsky, “Agrarian Conditions in the Byzantine Empire in the Middle Ages,” in *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, I (Cambridge, 1941), pp. 222-3. (I wish to thank my learned and ever generous friends, Professors Glanville Downey and Robert Lee Wolff, for several valuable suggestions in the preparation of this paper.)

² From the considerable literature on Roman imperial and early Byzantine Egypt we may notice here only the instructive pages by Angelo Segrè, “The Byzantine Colonate,” *Traditio*, V (1947), esp. pp. 119-28; H. I. Bell, *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest: A Study in the Diffusion and Decay of Hellenism* (Oxford, 1948); A. C. Johnson and L. C. West, *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies* (Princeton, 1949); and A. C. Johnson, *Egypt and the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor, 1951).

into classes, according to its size and the form of cultivation under which it was put. Units of so many *iugera* of sown land, of roughly equal productivity, were equated with so many *iugera* of vineyard or with so many olive trees on a given estate; the land was supposed to be reassessed every fifteen years (*indiciones*); and an impost known as the *iugatio* was levied upon each unit of taxable land (*iugum*), itself a computation based apparently upon the capacity of a yoke of oxen to plow it. But the *iugatio* prescinded from the necessity of available labor, human and animal, to work the land, and an additional impost fell upon the cultivators (*capitatio humana et animalium*): two estates of more or less equal extent, under the same kind of cultivation, might pay the same *iugatio*, but if one suffered from a shortage, and the other possessed a more abundant supply, of labor, the latter would pay a higher *capitatio*, for its yield would normally be larger. The *iugatio* levied on land, however, and the *capitatio* on labor, since they were, so to speak, obverse and reverse of the same coin, and were collected together, tended to become a single tax, for land without labor was inevitably unproductive, a source neither of profit to its owner nor of revenue to the state. Administrative convenience suggested the close association, even identification, of the two taxes; proprietors, assessors, and tax-collectors would be allowed, and on occasion, conceivably, required, to strike a taxable average between the *iuga* and *capita* on an estate; and the units of the tax on land were thus sometimes called *capita*, and the *iugatio* was sometimes called *capitatio*, which has created confusion in the sources, in the minds of contemporaries, and in the accounts of modern historians. If the land was to be taxed, it must be worked; if *iugatio* and *capitatio* could not be kept apart administratively, land and labor could not be left to drift apart economically and socially; the peasant was fixed to the soil (in A. D. 332); and then each *iugum*, it was hoped, would possess its *caput*; and social immobility and hereditary occupational status became the fundamental characteristics of life and work in the later Roman and early Byzantine periods. The colonate had been created; the peasants had become serfs, "adscript to the glebe" (*εναπόγραφοι*); they remained "free," with the rights of free men before the law, but they had lost their

freedom to move from the land and from their occupation upon it.³

It was in the late third century, especially, as the population continued to decline, that the government forced landowners to accept as their own, and to pay the taxes on, state land which the imperial government found unprofitable to work (*adiectio sterilium*) ; such was the *epibolé* in origin ;⁴ and soon the abandoned lands of private owners were also added to adjoining estates, and the new owners were obliged to pay the taxes which their predecessors in such properties had been unable to meet. The large estates, the *latifundia*, grew ever larger ; the government opposed their growth, but made it inevitable by exactions which drove the small cultivator to the wall. Famine and plague added to the general distress, and weakened or destroyed agricultural labor. The same situation obtained in Boeotia and Attica, presumably, as elsewhere in the Empire, and local

³ See especially André Piganiol, *L'Impôt de capitation sous le bas-empire romain* (Chambéry, 1916), and *idem*, "La Capitation de Dioclétien," *Revue historique*, CLXXVI (1935), pp. 9-10; F. Lot, *L'Impôt foncier et la capitation personnelle sous le bas-empire et à l'époque franque* (Bibl. de l'école des hautes études, Sciences historiques, fasc. 253 [Paris, 1928]), esp. pp. 40-64 (in the earlier portion of his book Lot gives a complete survey of older views on the meanings of *caput* and *iugum*, etc.); and cf. P. Charanis, "On the Social Structure of the Later Roman Empire," *Byzantion*, XVII (1944-1945), pp. 46-8.

The law of October, 332, which assumes the attachment of the *colonus* to his agricultural duties (*officia*) appears in the *Codex Theodosianus*, lib. V, tit. 17, 1; note also the numerous laws relating to the colonate in the *Codex Justinianus*, lib. XI, titt. 48 ff., 51-3 ff., 63-4. (The *Cod. Theod.* may now be read in *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*, trans. Clyde Pharr *et al.* [Princeton, 1952], lib. V, tit. 17, 1, appearing on p. 115.)

⁴ Cf., however, John Danstrup, "The State and Landed Property in Byzantium," in *Classica et Mediaevalia: Revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire*, VIII (Copenhagen, 1946), pp. 242 ff. On the conversion of state land (*ager publicus*) into private property (*ager privatus*), for purposes of taxation, see A. Segré, *Traditio*, V (1947), pp. 113-16. As for the Byzantine period, it should perhaps be observed, at this point, that the term "state land" has been commonly used in this paper to denote both the property of the state as such and the personal domain of the Emperor: although the domain of the state and the private property of the imperial family were separate "in principle, and technically for administrative purposes" (Ostrogorsky, *Cambr. Ec. History*, I, p. 212), the Emperor exercised complete control over both types of land and employed them both for the same purposes.

conditions, which have always made agriculture unrewarding in Greece, must often have caused the peasant's discomfort to mount into desperation. There was always a lack of manure for the fertilization of the fields. Excessive rains in the cold seasons chilled the soil, and, unless properly drained, were a serious obstacle to germination and growth; but, when the land had been drained, the summer drought came, and the solution of the former problem aggravated the severity of the second, for now adequate moisture was likely to be lacking. Constant plowing and pulverisation, however, impeded capillary action, and some moisture was retained in the soil, and without understanding the process, the Attic and Boeotian peasant survived on a precarious agriculture. In Attica the olive and the vine survived. The olive tree has long and searching roots which find water over a considerable area; if there is too much moisture, the olive tree "runs to wood"; and, like the later tobacco plant, is most satisfactory for human consumption if it is not too large and tough. In Greece, too, violent rains turned summer-dry rivers into torrents, which carried off, in futile haste and even fury, nutritive substances from the thin soil into the sea. Ever since the mountain sides had been stripped of their forests in antiquity the problem had been difficult and dangerous, and in Boeotia and Attica it remains so to this day.⁵

In an agrarian society the chief source of wealth is land, the productivity of which supports the state as well as most of its citizens. It is easily possible, of course, to underestimate the contributions of both commerce and industry to the economy of Byzantium. In Constantinople and Thessalonica, Thebes, Corinth, and elsewhere fine silk fabrics were produced for centuries; and so were brocades and jewelry; carved ivories and enamelled plates; glass- and bronze-ware; and ecclesiastical equipment of many kinds. The court and especially the church consumed such goods in vast quantities; but, for all this, the wealth which purchased these products was very largely of agrarian origin. It is true that commerce was a source of much revenue to the state, which imposed heavy duties both on imports and exports, and of no small profit to Byzantine merchants whose

⁵ Cf., in general, the instructive chapter by C. E. Stevens, on "Agriculture and Rural Life in the Later Roman Empire," in the *Cambridge Economic History*, I.

ships plied the lucrative sea-lanes of the Aegean and even of the western Mediterranean. The Byzantine state was almost a corporative state; the late Benito Mussolini would have been pleased with it; important trade and industry were rigidly organized in guilds. Liberal historians of the nineteenth century were almost astonished by the strictness of this organization and control; the present-day historian seems to regard some such regimentation as the inevitable consequence of an extreme centralization of government. Be all this as it may, however, it was agriculture which employed the vast majority of the peoples of the Byzantine Empire in every generation of its history, although the towns, to be sure, never declined in the east as they did in western Europe, and urbanization always remained one of the more conspicuous features of Byzantine society from the fourth century until the end came in the fifteenth. It must also be remembered that the profits of commercial enterprise were often invested in land. The Byzantine Empire was centered in its capital on the Bosphorus, which lay at the crossroads of three continents; to this center the commerce of southern and eastern Europe, north Africa, and western Asia tended to gravitate. The situation of Byzantium was, however, as great a source of military danger as of commercial profit, for if traders naturally sought the roads and sea-routes to Byzantium, so too did hosts of invaders. Byzantium survived, because, in response to unceasing danger, it became militarized; this development came in the seventh century, as we shall note again very shortly; the new military state rested primarily upon its agriculture, not upon its commerce and industry. The Byzantine Empire paid the price of this centralization of its strength and intelligence within the walls of the capital, for if the latter were to fall the Empire would fall, just as France seems to fall with Paris. It was, therefore, above all necessary to secure the capital against the attacks of enemies; the provinces also had to be firmly bound to the capital, which looked to them for its food supply and for soldiers. The relation of the capital to the defense of the frontier had presented to the central government problems of predominant importance for generations before the founding of Constantinople on the site of the ancient Megarian city of Byzantium, by which name the new city was also known, and by which name the so-called later Roman Empire was itself to be called.

Apparently from the time of Alexander Severus (222-235) peasant soldiers had received from the state hereditary lands on the frontier (*agri limitanei*) in return for the military service whereby the frontier provinces were to be defended from barbarian attack. A novel of Theodosius II, issued in September of 443, confirmed the long-standing practice of military (and agricultural) service for the possession of these frontier holdings in the Balkans, Asia Minor, and in Egypt. The great invasions of the seventh century made necessary the militarization of the Byzantine state and provincial administration; the government now "applied the former frontier organization to the inland provinces."⁶ Along the eastern frontiers, in the almost ceaseless defense and offense against the Moslem, a new *miles limitaneus* appears, who draws his name, like his western predecessor, from the frontier (*ἀκρα*), which he defends; this is the strong and independent *akrites* (*ἀκρίτης*), who defends the Moslem "marches" in Asia Minor with such prowess as to become the subject of a rich legend and to supply the materials for a popular epic on the tenth-century hero [Basil] Digenes Akrites, a Byzantine warrior whose anti-Moslem efforts can match those of the French Roland and the Castilian Cid.⁷

The century or so which lies between the successors of Justinian and those of Heraclius was an era of blood and iron, but it was also productive of the basic political and economic institutions upon which the Byzantine Empire stood until the eleventh century. It was a robust and brutal age, and historians are afflicted with a strange myopia who see in Byzantine civilization chiefly a picture of effete literati and abstruse theologians, intriguing courtiers and eunuchs, quarrelsome ecclesiastics, imperial libertines, and beautiful women in bridal shows; these things there were, and Byzantium has not always been fortunate in her modern interpreters; but there are other more important aspects of Byzantine civilization to which the serious historian

⁶ See the *Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, ed. Th. Mommsen and Paul M. Meyer (Berlin, 1905), Nov. XXIV, 4 (p. 63); retained in *Code Iustiniani*, lib. XI, tit. 60, art. 3; cf. Vasiliev, *Byzantium*, VIII, p. 588; *idem*, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Madison, 1952), p. 567; and also Eugen Darkó, "La militarizzazione dell' Impero Bizantino," in *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, V (Rome, 1939), pp. 90-1.

⁷ Cf. A. A. Vasiliev, *Hist. Byz. Emp.*, I (1928), pp. 446-8; 2nd Engl. ed. (1952), p. 370.

gives his attention. The inroads of Slavs, Bulgars, and Avars in the north, of Persians and Arabs in the south, wiped out in the seventh century much of the latifundial system inherited by the Byzantine from the later Roman Empire. Some of these peoples, especially the Slavs, remained in the Empire, in continental Greece and perhaps in the Peloponnesus, and they were settled by the government in Asia Minor. The violence of the seventh century resulted in a great social and economic levelling, with the submergence of a number of great families, the reorganization of provincial administration (into the thematic system), the rebuilding of the army and navy, and the thoroughgoing militarization of the central government.

Perhaps the most astonishing single fact about the history of the seventh century is the replacement, in many parts of the Empire, of the great estates by small freeholds. All the great estates were not destroyed—far from it—nor did all peasants live henceforth on small freeholds; but it would be difficult to say which was the predominant tenure in a given theme, and this very fact is evidence of a profound social transformation. Great estates had been looted, cadastral records destroyed, and serfs had fled in the turmoil; when lands were resettled, a man's labor was more important than his origin, he had acquired freedom, and changes in taxation, provincial administration, and in the recruitment of the army moved the government to protect him in his new freedom and mobility. The head tax (the old *capitatio*) and the land tax (the old *iugatio*) were separated in the seventh century. In fact the head tax became, rather, a hearth tax ($\tauὸ\ καπνικόν$), paid by all families, and since it had little or nothing to do with the land tax ($\dot{\eta}\ συνωνή$), the government seems to have had little further interest in fixing the peasant on the land.⁸ From the seventh century to the eleventh there appears to have been a largely free peasantry in the Byzantine Empire, a phenomenon which Paparrhigopoulos ascribed to an imaginary social revolution brought about by the Isaurians, to whom are attributed the ideas of a Joseph II of Austria, and the cause of which Uspenskii found in the influence

⁸ See Georg Ostrogorsky, "Das Steuersystem im byzantinischen Altertum und Mittelalter," *Byzantion*, VI (1931), pp. 232 ff., but the problem is very complicated (cf. Franz Dölger, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXXIV [1934], pp. 370-3).

of a mythical Slavonic *Volksrecht*; Constantinescu, however, has found the cause, or at least the chief manifestation of the cause, of this alleged disappearance of "serfdom on the glebe" in the Byzantine Empire in the fiscal reform which separated the land tax from the head tax, for the reason we have just noted.⁹ In any event the sources, such as the Farmer's Law, which has been dated by some scholars in the first reign of Justinian II (685-695), but which Franz Dölger would put a little later, and the so-called *Treatise on Taxation*, which apparently dates from the time of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, contain abundant evidence of the mobility of the agricultural classes. From the seventh century on, soldiers were given military freeholds (*στρατιωτικὰ κτήματα* or *τόπια*), in return for their service, and the government protected them in their new estates; this was part of the new organization of the themes, and the barbarian mercenary, the employment of whom Synesius of Cyrene had feared and deprecated, henceforth rarely serves Byzantium, except, later on, as a palace guard. The state is served by soldiers grown, so to speak, on its own soil. The peasant freeholds and the military estates were dear to the hearts of the Emperors from the seventh century to the eleventh.¹⁰ Let us turn our

⁹ N. A. Constantinescu, "Réforme sociale ou réforme fiscale? Une hypothèse pour expliquer la disparition du servage de la glèbe dans l'empire byzantin," *Bulletin de la section historique de l'Académie Roumaine*, XI (1924), esp. pp. 101 ff.: "La propriété paye l'impôt foncier et le cultivateur sans propriété paye le kapnikon, impôt personnel . . . [p. 103]. Par ce fait, le fisc byzantin rompt sans fracas le lien de la glèbe et rend à tous les paysans, à l'exception des esclaves, la plénitude des droits civils" [p. 108]. Constantinescu's paper is very learned and instructive, but he has given altogether too categorical expression to his views. Cf. John Danstrup, in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, VIII, pp. 234-5, and the grave doubts to which Franz Dölger has given sweeping expression in his article, "Ist der Nomos Georgikos ein Gesetz des Kaisers Justinian II?" in the *Festschrift für Leopold Wenger: Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte*, XXXV (1945), *passim*, esp. pp. 21-8. (Dölger summarizes much of the older literature.)

¹⁰ Cf. the interesting essays of Georg Ostrogorsky, "Die wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Entwicklungsgrundlagen d. byzant. Reiches," in the *Vierteljahrsschrift f. Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, XXII (1929), pp. 130-3, and Eugen Darkó, "La militarizzazione dell' Impero Bizantino," in *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, V (1939), p. 96. Small military estates (called *oikonomiai* and even *pronoiai*, on which latter see *infra*)

attention, for a little while, to the Byzantine Farmer's Law and to the *Treatise on Taxation*.

The Farmer's Law (*Νόμος Γεωργικός*),¹¹ which has been assigned by G. Vernadsky and G. Ostrogorsky to the time of the Emperor Justinian II, was not designed as an agricultural code which should regulate the lives of all who tilled the soil; its purpose was much more specific; it is an official (or unofficial) compilation of practices and enactments intended solely to apply to the free village community (*τὸ χωρίον*), wherein lives "the peasant who works his own field" (*ὁ γεωργὸς ὁ ἐργαζόμενος τὸν ἔδιον ἀγρόν*).¹² It is not concerned with the large estates on which there were, of course, both serfs and slaves all through the Byzantine period.¹³ Zachariae von Lingenthal and Ashburner were agreed "that the 'style of command' in the Farmer's Law suggests that it is not by a private hand but a work of legislative authority."¹⁴

The same view has been more recently expressed by both Vernadsky and Ostrogorsky, with whom Franz Dölger now takes issue. According to Dölger, the Farmer's Law is actually a private compilation, its contents having suggested its title *Nomos Georgikos*; it is based upon the *Corpus Iuris* of Justinian I and

were still numerous in the thirteenth century, apparently the result of attempted reconstruction of the military forces (see P. Charanis, "On the Social Structure and Economic Organization of the Byzantine Empire in the Thirteenth Century and Later," *Byzantinoslavica*, XII [1951], pp. 131-3, and G. Ostrogorsky, "Le Système de la pronoia à Byzance et en Serbie médiévale," in the *Actes du VI^e Congrès international d'études byzantines*, I [Paris, 1950], pp. 182-4), but owing to the political decentralization of the Empire, from the earlier fourteenth century on, it became almost impossible to organize soldiers recruited from such estates for a campaign.

¹¹ A good text of the Farmer's Law, *Κεφάλαια νόμου γεωργικοῦ κατ' ἔκλογὴν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ βιβλίου*, as set up by Walter Ashburner, may be found in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXX (1910), pp. 97-108, together with a translation and commentary (*ibid.*, XXXII [1912], pp. 68-95). Cf. Geo. Vernadsky, "Sur les origines de la Loi agraire byzantine," *Byzantion*, II (1925), pp. 169-80; Ernst Stein, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXIX (1929), p. 355; and Ostrogorsky, *ibid.*, XXX (1929-1930), p. 396.

¹² *Nomos Georgikos*, art. 1, ed. Ashburner, *J. H. S.*, XXX, p. 97.

¹³ Cf. Ashburner, *J. H. S.*, XXXII, p. 77; Ostrogorsky, *Vierteljahrsschr. f. Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XX, pp. 11-12.

¹⁴ Ashburner, *J. H. S.*, XXXII, p. 83.

upon the Greek *Paratitla* thereto, the *Paratitla* being later marginal glosses on and simplified summaries of the law (*griechische Randkommentare*). Since Dölger is not able to find, however, many very clear or precise parallels between the Farmer's Law and the *Corpus Iuris* (those he finds come largely from the *Digest*), he assumes that the Farmer's Law also contains in part peasants' customary law and a general statement of the commonly practiced punishments for its infraction. Since Dölger insists that the Farmer's Law is an unofficial text, compiled for the convenience of Byzantine jurists, he naturally assigns its promulgation to no particular Emperor, for it was not thus "promulgated"; he dates the Farmer's Law, however, between the beginning of the seventh century and the first quarter of the eighth, stating that it may have been put together during the reign of Leo III and Constantine V between 720 and 741.¹⁵ It may be observed, however, that Dölger dates the Farmer's Law at pretty much the same time as Vernadsky and Ostrogorsky, although he disputes their precise assignment of the text to Justinian II, in whom he is unable to see a "Gesetzgeber." Whether "official" or "unofficial," the Farmer's Law, prepared as a practical manual for Byzantine jurists, doubtless had the force of law, and would be administered in the courts. The reader must recognize this fact, and in this fact lies the social significance of the Farmer's Law in any study of Byzantine agrarian history.

The Farmer's Law consists of eighty-five brief articles regulating the affairs of the free village community, which was itself a fiscal district (*ὑποταγὴ χωρίου*), upon which fell a general tax (*ρίζα χωρίου*), which was the common responsibility and

¹⁵ Franz Dölger, *Festschrift für Leopold Wenger*, pp. 33-4, 43 ff., and 48, where Dölger summarizes his views to the effect that "der Nomos Georgikos ist eine private, seinem Titel entsprechend auf der Grundlage des *Corpus Iuris Justinians I.* und seiner griechischen *Paratitla* beruhende, zum Teil aber auch bäuerliches Gewohnheitsrecht sowie üblich gewordene Strafmasse neu aufzeichnende Kompilation, entstanden zwischen dem Anfang des 7. und dem ersten Viertel des 8. Jahrhunderts, wobie die Annahme einer Entstehung unter der Regierung der Kaiser Leon III. und Konstantinos V. (720-741) nicht unwahrscheinlich ist." Cf. also Dölger, "Harmenopoulos u. der Nomos Georgikos," in the *Tόμος Κωνσταντίνου Αρμενοπούλου* (Faculty of Law, University of Thessalonike, 1951), p. 161.

burden of all who held property in the village community.¹⁶ This Law was observed from the very late seventh or early eighth century until, conceivably, the early eleventh or even later. It deals with the maintenance of boundaries between farms; exchanges of property and disputes concerning ownership; leases, tenancy on shares of the produce, and hired labor; taxes (but only arts. 18-19); and matters involving cattle, oxen, and dogs; problems arising from theft, destruction of crops, vines, trees, and fences; trespasses on vineyards and figyards; burning of farmhouses; and a multiplicity of other crimes and misdemeanors likely to occur in an agricultural settlement. A free society is depicted in the Law, unlike that revealed, for example, in the Carolingian *Capitulare de villis* of a rather later era. Ashburner expressed the opinion, without appreciating, apparently, the historical background of the Law or the significance of his own observation, that almost one third of the Farmer's Law was "new legislation."¹⁷ It does seem to have been "new," not caused, however, by the customs of new settlers, such as the Slavs,¹⁸ but rather necessitated by the new conditions created by the inroads of Slavs, Bulgars, and Avars, Persians and Arabs, which wiped out, as we have noted, large numbers of the *latifundia* upon which serfdom had been, from the fourth century, almost the universal and certainly the characteristic form of agricultural labor everywhere in the Empire. The Farmer's Law illustrates in a general way the life of the Athenian peasant in the eighth and ninth centuries, although the specific application of the Law to Attica would involve the difficulty that the olive is nowhere mentioned in its numerous provisions.¹⁹

More comprehensive than the view given us by the Farmer's Law of the economic and social structure of the Byzantine Empire in the middle period of its history is that to be found in the instructive Byzantine *Treatise on Taxation*.²⁰ From the

¹⁶ Cf. Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 22-3, 45-7.

¹⁷ *J. H. S.*, XXXII, p. 84.

¹⁸ Cf. Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 12-13, cf. 43-4.

¹⁹ Cf. Ashburner, *J. H. S.*, XXXII, p. 71.

²⁰ The important "Byzantine Treatise of Taxation" was first published by Walter Ashburner, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXXV (1915), pp. 76-84, and later made the basis of a valuable paper by Georg Ostrogorsky, "Die ländliche Steuergemeinde des byzantinischen

twenty-nine chapters of this brief tract much can be learned of the economic and administrative organization of Byzantine farming communities, including those in Boeotia and Attica. A multiplicity of taxes are listed and described in the *Treatise*, which Ostrogorsky, Dölger, and others have made the subject of fruitful studies. Free peasants are found to be settled in the Byzantine Empire, as in western and central Europe, in two main types of agricultural community, the "nucleated village" (*τὸ χωρίον*), the *Dorf* or *Gemeindedorf*, and the separate farmsteads or hamlets (sing. *ἡ κτῆσις*), *Weiler*, *Dorfsiedelung in Einzelhöfen*.²¹ Not unlike the hamlets, although different in origin, were the private properties of those who preferred, sometimes for good reasons, to live on the outskirts of the city, town, or village or beyond its boundaries and quite without its territory. Here we find, thus isolated, both small freeholds (*ἀγρόδια*), cultivated by the proprietor and his family, and the large estates (*προάστεια*),²² worked by slaves, serfs, and leaseholders, who received land on short-term leases for half the produce (they were called *ἡμισιαταί*), or on long-term leases, according to which, it would appear, they received nine tenths of the produce (*μορτίται*), but in the latter case the leaseholders or *μορτίται* doubtless had certain services to perform for the landlord (*χωροδότης*).²³ The village community, as a social and fiscal entity (*τοῦ χωρίου κοινότης, δύμας, ἀνακοίνωσις, μετονοσία*),²⁴ possessed few rights and functions of self-government, for the ubiquitous Byzantine officialdom made all decisions and attended to almost all matters of local business. The tax inspector (*ἐπόπτης*) assessed the land in the village community, which also formed commonly

Reiches im X. Jahrhundert," *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 1-108, with a German translation of the text, *Traktat über die Steuererhebung* (pp. 91-103).

²¹ Cf. Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 16-17, *et alibi*, and *idem*, "Agrarian Conditions in the Byzantine Empire in the Middle Ages," in *Cambr. Ec. Hist.*, I, pp. 198-9.

²² On the *ἀγρόδια* and *προάστεια*, see Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 17-21, cf. 42-3, and text of the treatise on taxation in Ashburner, *J. H. S.*, XXXV (1915), pp. 77-8, 80-1 (pars. 3-5, 12-13).

²³ Ashburner, *J. H. S.*, XXXII, pp. 82-3; Ostrogorsky, in *Cambr. Ec. Hist.*, I, pp. 200-1.

²⁴ On these terms, which all describe the same thing, i. e. *die Gemeindeverfassung der Dorfsiedelungen*, see Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 15-16; cf. *idem*, *Cambr. Ec. Hist.*, I, pp. 201-2.

a tax district (*ὑποταγὴ χωρίου*), established the general or "root" tax to be paid by the community (*ρίζα χωρίου*), and apportioned his share of the tax to each member of the community (i. e. *όμας*, etc.).²⁵ The inspectors were imperial appointees, *ἐπόπται τῶν θεμάτων*, sent into the themes or provinces with responsibility for the detailed superintendence of tax-collection in the territory assigned to them; as a class the inspectors had a bad reputation, like the French intendants of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who became known in their day as the "thirty tyrants." The tyranny and capriciousness of the high officials in the Byzantine financial service were notorious, and there are some almost classic complaints voiced in the letters of Michael Psellus, the Metropolitan Theophylact of Bulgaria, and the Metropolitan Michael Choniates of Athens.²⁶

During the early Byzantine period the government had forced landowners to take over abandoned lands by holding them responsible, under the *epibolé*, as we have noted, for the taxes on such lands. If the landowners had thus to pay the land tax, they had best take the land also, and, if possible, put it under cultivation to minimize or avoid loss. The cultivation of the land itself was, of course, what the government wished in this early era of scarce labor and sadly diminished productivity. During the middle Byzantine period the system of responsibility for the taxes on abandoned land continued to fall on the unfortunate neighbor of the peasant who had fled, died without heirs, or had otherwise proved incapable of paying his taxes. The surtax was now called the *allelengyon*. The government, how-

²⁵ Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 22-3, 45-7, 71.

²⁶ Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 74, 75, 80-1 ff., 85. Cf. Matthias Wellnhofer, *Johannes Apokaukos* (diss. Munich, 1913), pp. 20-1. Michael Choniates complains to the Emperor Alexius III Angelus that Byzantine tax assessors surveyed land with measures so small as to check "the footprints of fleas" (Sp. P. Lampros, ed., *The Extant Works of Michael Acominatus Choniates* [in Greek] [2 vols., Athens, 1879-1880], I, p. 307). The present article contains only occasional references to the works of Michael Choniates, with which I have already dealt superficially in connection with conditions in Athens in the later twelfth century (*Speculum*, XIX [1944], pp. 179-207, and *ibid.*, XXI [1946], pp. 234-6). Michael's evidence concerning conditions in Attica, Boeotia, and the islands (from 1182 to 1204) will be discussed at some length in my history of *Athens in the Middle Ages*, which I expect to have ready for the press in about three years.

ever, was now chiefly interested in taxing, as a source of revenue, those whose own property was near an abandoned property, although here too the taxpayer would inevitably seek to cultivate the new lands which he was obliged to take over, and this had become an easier undertaking in the eighth and ninth centuries because of the increased availability of agricultural labor. The *allelengyon*, however, sometimes ruined the small peasant farmer upon whom it fell, for he might well be unable to pay the additional tax, and would most likely lack the capital to bring his unwillingly acquired lands under profitable cultivation (indeed, he may have acquired these lands because his predecessor had been unable to make them pay enough to meet his taxes), and so his sole solution of the difficult problem that faced him might be the abandonment of his own lands in order to escape the new burden which the government was forcing upon him. Still more land was thus vacated, with no one to pay the taxes. In this way much land was detached from the village community and removed from the tax registers since solvent landowners who could pay the required surtax or *allelengyon* were not to be found in the village; under such circumstances the government might not press for payment of the *allelengyon*; but the abandoned lands became state property, eventually to be sold or pledged, for the most part, to large landowners, both lay and ecclesiastical, who could often expect to secure their position and property by procuring from the Emperor an immunity or exemption from taxation.²⁷ The peasants dispossessed in this way, and in other ways, must have formed something of a landless, footloose population, some of whom became lessees of the lands of others, or turned to piracy, or simply wandered around the country. In Attica we have explicit evidence of the existence of such people, in the works of the Athenian Metropolitan Michael Choniates, who declares that "there has come

²⁷ On the *allelengyon*, mentioned in articles 12 and 14 of the *Treatise on Taxation* (in *J. H. S.*, XXXV, pp. 80, 81), see Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 3-4, 15, esp. 25-32, 35, 45, 74. By the time of the emperor Nicephorus I (802-811) the term *epibolé* had been more or less displaced by the term *allelengyon* (*V. S. W. G.*, XX, p. 29). However, cf. John Danstrup, in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, VIII, pp. 250 ff., on what he regards as the difference between *epibolé* (the enforced assumption of waste lands by neighbors) and the *allelengyon* (mutual liability by neighbors for another's taxes).

upon us a boorish people, beggarly in mind and in body, quick to wander off and seek their food now in one place, now in another, and thence to fly away again like migratory birds.”²⁸

The emergence of a new Byzantine gentry, growing into a new landed aristocracy, is apparent before the beginning of the tenth century, and the issue is clearly drawn in a struggle between the magnates (the *dynatoi*) and the free village communities, most of which had come into being with the destruction of the great estates in the blood-and-iron era of the seventh century. The tenth-century Emperors vigorously supported the peasants in their freeholds in the village communities (*όμαδες* or *ἀνακοινώσεις τῶν χωρίων*) and the soldiers in their military estates (*στρατιωτικὰ τόπια*), for they had perceived that the structure of the Byzantine state and of society depended upon these two classes.²⁹ A novel of the Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus gives the classic statement of the reasons for the imperial protection of the small freeholders against lay and ecclesiastical lords who tended, by purchase or by force, to acquire their lands. “We do not make these laws from hatred and envy of those who are strong,” the Emperor says in 934, “but we declare them for love of the poor, for their protection, and for the common safety.”³⁰ High officials of the court, the army, the civil service, the provincial administration, and the church are “no longer to dare” to acquire the property of the poor (*penetes*) on any pretext or for any reason whatsoever, for the power of such persons has augmented the great suffering of the poor and inflicted heavy burdens upon them. Unless, in fact, the present law puts a stop to the many abuses that now exist, the Emperor foresees the destruction of the welfare of the state. “For the settlement of the many on the land provides most of the necessities of society; it is from them that the public taxes are collected, and the rendering of military service is required, and these things will be wanting if the common people go under [ἀ πάντως ἀπολείψει τοῦ πλήθους

²⁸ Mich. Chon., *Ep.* 8, 3 (Lampros, II, p. 12).

²⁹ Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 14-16; *ibid.*, XXII, pp. 132 ff., and cf. Ernst Stein, “Spätbyzant. Verfassungs- u. Wirtschaftsgesch.,” *Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte*, II (1923-1926), pp. 7-9.

³⁰ Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Jus graeco-romanum*, pars III: *Novellae constitutiones* (Leipzig, 1857), coll. III, nov. V, p. 246; Franz Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oström. Reiches*, I (1924), no. 628, pp. 77-8.

ἐκλελουτότος].”⁸¹ The Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus continued the struggle against the “powerful” in behalf of the “poor,” and the Emperor Basil II attempted, almost, the dissolution of the magnates with whom he had much trouble, and sought to recreate, as it were, the social conditions of the seventh and eighth centuries in which the free peasant had been safe in the proprietary right to his land and the soldier secure in the possession of his military estate. In the year 1002 Basil II obliged the magnates to pay the *allelengyon*, the tax on abandoned property, which, as we have seen, had hitherto fallen in

⁸¹ Zachariae, *Jus graeco-romanum*, III, pp. 246-7. Cf. Georg Stadt-müller, “Oströmische Bauern- und Wehrpolitik,” *Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Wissenschaft*, XIII (1937), pp. 428-30; Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XXII, pp. 133-4; Charanis, *Byzantion*, XVII (1944-45), p. 52. There is a series of eleven important imperial “constitutions” promulgated in behalf of the threatened small proprietors in the tenth century. In April of 922 Romanus I Lecapenus gave various categories of small proprietors the right of prior purchase (*protimesis*) to the lands of their fellow peasants, as such lands were offered for sale, restricting under penalty the further acquisition of peasant holdings by the *dynatoi* (Zachariae, *J. G. R.*, III, coll. III, nov. II, pp. 234-41; Fr. Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden*, I [1924], no. 595, pp. 71-2, on which cf. Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 32 ff., and *Cambr. Ec. Hist.*, I, p. 205). Famine and plague in the winter of 927-928, however, gave the *dynatoi* an opportunity, which they did not fail to take, to buy up cheaply much land from the harassed and frightened peasantry; this led to renewed imperial prohibitions in the law of September, 934, cited, *supra*, in the text (Zachariae, *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 242-52; Dölger, *Regesten*, I, no. 628), which excoriates the *dynatoi* as “like unto the plague or like unto gangrene” (Zach., *J. G. R.*, III, p. 247, lines 28-29). The large landowners had to be watched with unceasing vigilance. In March of 947 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus legislated against the unlawful acquisition by the “powerful” of the lands of the “poor” in Asia Minor (Zachariae, *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 252-6; Dölger, *Regesten*, I, no. 656); another law of Constantine, of uncertain date, sought to protect the integrity of the military estates, on which the army and the Aegean fleet depended so much (Zach., *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 261-6; Dölger, *Regesten*, I, no. 673, pp. 83-5); and still other laws were issued by Constantine and by his son Romanus II to protect the lands of the small peasant proprietors, and to protect the small military estates also, against the ever unrequited desires of the *dynatoi* to add to their now great landed possessions (Zach., *J. G. R.*, III, coll. III, nos. XIV-XVI, pp. 281-7). According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ law of March, 947, when lands of the *dynatoi* came up for sale, the small proprietors were to enjoy the prior right of purchase, but in 967 Nicephorus II Phocas abrogated this law, which had given the peasant, with his smaller com-

the village communities upon the unfortunate neighbors of the peasant who had given up the struggle with the adversities of farming and of dealing with rapacious tax-collectors. Now the powerful were to pay this tax (or the accumulated arrears thereof), instead of the poor, but they were not to take over the land for which they paid the tax.³² The large landowners eventually won, however, and there was probably as much desperation as legal severity behind the measures of Basil II. In

petitive strength, a conceivable chance against the large landowner, and established an alleged equality between small and large proprietors in their rights to the acquisition of land (Zach., *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 296-9; Dölger, *Regesten*, I, no. 712). Nicephorus Phocas did, of course, maintain the soldiers' estates, but since the minimum holding of this type was now increased from a value of four pounds of gold to twelve, the effect must have been to create a country gentry, so to speak, a class of military squires (Zach., *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 299-300; Dölger, *Regesten*, I, no. 721), and we may assume that the small military peasant proprietor would generally fail to hold his own. By a sort of statute of mortmain Nicephorus Phocas in 964 forbade the establishment of new monasteries, hostels, and homes for the aged, in connection with which he also forbade any further acquisitions of land by churches and monasteries (Zach., *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 292-6; Dölger, *Regesten*, I, no. 699; Charanis, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, no. IV, pp. 56-8); Nicephorus urged, however, the restoration and maintenance, through gifts of money, of some of the many penurious monasteries already in existence. This law, which may not have been enforced after Nicephorus, was formally rescinded by Basil II in 988, at the intercession of "the pious monks and many others" (Zach., *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 303-4; Dölger, *Regesten*, I, no. 772). In 996 Basil II reestablished, with much vigor, the prohibitions of Romanus Lecapenus against the further acquisition of peasant lands by the *dynatoi* (Zach., *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 308 ff.; Dölger, *Regesten*, I, no. 783, p. 100); he also impeded the bishops in their unceasing attempts to secure more lands in the free village communities, lands which were sometimes granted to lay lords as "benefices" (*charistikia*). But in the long run the efforts of Basil proved of no avail; ultimate victory lay with the large landowners, and therewith came the feudalization of the Byzantine Empire. See the illuminating article by Erik Bach, "Les Lois agraires byzantines du X^e siècle," in *Classica et mediaevalia: Revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire*, V (Copenhagen, 1942), pp. 70-91, and cf. John Danstrup, *ibid.*, VIII (1946), pp. 236-7. I have not yet seen J. de Malafosse, "Les Lois agraires à l'époque byzantine: Tradition et exégèse," *Recueil de l'Académie de Législation*, XXIX (1949), 75 pp., cited by F[ranz] Dölger, *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLIII (1950), p. 245.

³² Geo. Cedrenus, II, 456, and John Zonaras, III, 561, on which texts see John Danstrup, *Classica et Mediaevalia*, VIII (1946), pp. 256-62.

any event, the *allelengyon*, which had weighed so heavily upon the peasantry for generations, was soon abolished, for the most part, now that it fell upon the magnates: legislation against it was promulgated by the Emperor Romanus III Argyrus (1028-1034), who in this as in other matters gave way before the magnates.³³ The *dynatoi* had won; the peasant had been defeated; the fears of Romanus Lecapenus were realized; the Emperor's control of the state was henceforth to be hampered; the strength of the central administration was quickly diminished; and the disaster of Manzikert was inevitably being prepared for.

The great landowners, especially the ecclesiastical landowners, escaped much taxation and governmental control by securing imperial letters of exemption therefrom; such were the immunities from taxation and from various other *corvées* granted by Constantine IX Monomachus to the Nea Moné on the island of Chios and by Alexius I Comnenus to the Monastery of St. John on the island of Patmos.³⁴ The Byzantine immunity was commonly known as the *exkousseia* (ἐξκούσσεια), i. e. the Latin *excusatio*, and although its derivation directly from the Roman imperial *immunitas* may be disputed, its operation as an economic and social force was attended in the Byzantine Empire by the same legal consequences as the immunity in the later Roman Empire. Since imperial officials were by and large restricted from entering the immunity to collect taxes or to do justice, public authority inevitably passed into private hands, i. e. into the hands of the communist and his retainers. The advantages accruing from grants of immunity may have helped cause that era of monastic well-being and prosperity, in the later ninth and earlier tenth centuries, which followed upon

³³ Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 3-4, 15, 32. Contrary to the view most commonly held, the *allelengyon* did not entirely disappear in 1028 (John Danstrup, *Classica et Mediaevalia*, VIII [1946], pp. 259-60). Furthermore, the *epibolé*, so closely related to the *allelengyon*, probably survived even into the 14th century (cf. Germaine Rouillard, "L'Epibolé au temps d'Alexis I Comnène," *Byzantion*, X [1935], pp. 81-9, and Franz Dölger, *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXXVI [1936], pp. 157-61), and not only the *epibolé* but also the *protimesis* (the right of a neighbor to the prior purchase of property up for sale, on which see, *supra*, note 31) survived into a late period (see P. Charanis, *Byzantinoslavica*, XII [1951], pp. 123-4).

³⁴ Zachariae von Lingenthal, *J. G. R.*, III, pp. 370-1; Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et diplomata*, VI, 45.

the conclusion of the second iconoclastic period. In any event the Byzantine ecclesiastical immunity can be subjected to the full light of historical investigation only from the middle of the eleventh century when the documents attesting its widespread existence become rather numerous. Many grants of immunity were made during the period of governmental decentralization which followed the death of Basil II in 1025, and they continued to be made throughout the period of Comnenian rule (1081-1185). The century of unbroken, even if often disputed, succession of one member of the Comnenian house by another has given a certain appearance of strength and solidity to this period which more than one recent historian has come to regard as specious.

It must be remembered that, if the Byzantine Empire was the heir and successor of the later Roman Empire, we are dealing, *ipso facto*, with the heritage of the Theodosians, not of the Antonines. Quite apart from the growing danger from the west, which several times threatened the Byzantine capital in those great marauding expeditions called Crusades, there were certain practices or institutions within Byzantine society itself which were disruptive of good order and detrimental to the interests of the central government. The chief of these was probably the immunity, an inheritance from the distant past, but attention must also be called to the practice of granting fiefs, which were called *pronoiai*, to great lords in return for military and other service, as the Empire became increasingly feudalized in the course of the later eleventh and twelfth centuries, and to the institution of patronage, known in Greek as *prostasia*, which in some respects suggests the western practice of commendation. Both this patronage and the Byzantine fief seem to be, in their remote origins, part of the medieval Greek heritage from the Roman imperial past.³⁵ The immunity, the fief, patronage,

³⁵ The economic and social organization of the later Roman Empire had also been, in the Theodosian era, especially characterized by these three institutions: 1) the granting of immunity, or exemption, from certain taxes and obligations commonly owing to the state (*immunitas, excusatio*); 2) the widespread granting and holding of land by "precarious tenure," the *precarium* (later *precaria*, in the west, and *beneficium*, with which compare the Byzantine *charistikion*); and, finally, *feudum*, with which compare the Byzantine *pronoia*); and 3) the system of patronage (*patrocinium*), which seems to survive to some extent in the later western *commendatio* and the Byzantine *prostasia*. On the

these were corrosive elements in the substance of society in the later eleventh and twelfth centuries. Their operation had been impeded, and their effects obscured, by that long period of strong central administration which had lasted, whatever its vicissitudes of fortune, from the Emperor Heraclius to Basil II, but thereafter they had been able to do their work, and decomposition proceeded rapidly.

Byzantine society also knew another kind of fief, or rather benefice, called in Greek the *charistikion*, which was of much importance in the medieval history of Athens, as well as of other communities in the Empire. The *charistikion* was a benefice (*beneficium*); its holder was a *charistikarios* or beneficiary (*beneficiarius*).³⁶ In the beginning, it could have been, just possibly, a later adaptation of the Roman imperial practice of granting land in return for certain services, although when the documents become numerous enough to enable economic historians to study the institution in some detail, the term *charistikion* applies solely to grants of monastic land, the *charistikarios*, or beneficiary of such a grant, being bound to support the monks, keep up the buildings, and provide for religious and other services, the excess revenue being his own income, which explains his interest in acquiring the *charistikion*. *Charistikia* were invented and widely granted by the first iconoclasts, especially by Constantine V Copronymus, according to the Patriarch John V of Antioch, who composed a tract, at the close of the eleventh century, "on monastic discipline and the danger of immunity (*exkousseia*) from the Roman Empire to the high middle ages, both in the east and the west, see G. Ferrari dalle Spade, "Immunità ecclesiastica nel diritto romano," in the *Atti R. Istit. Veneto di Scien., Lett. ed Arti, Cl. di Sc. mor. e Lett.*, XCIX (1939-40), pp. 103-248.

³⁶ John Danstrup, "The State and Landed Property in Byzantium to c. 1250," in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, VIII, p. 232, equates the Byzantine *charistikarios* with the western *advocatus*. (The *charistikion*, however, was revocable, as we shall see, by the Holy Synod in Constantinople.) On the *charistikion* see in general the brilliant study of Emilio Herman, "Ricerche sulle istituzioni monastiche byzantine: Typika, ktetorika, caristicari, e monastici 'liberi,'" in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VI (1940), esp. pp. 297, 316-47, 372-5, who observes (p. 316): "Diversi sono i nomi dati nelle fonti a questi beneficiari, ma il più comune è quello di *caristicari*." Cf. Waldemar Nissen, *Die Diataxis d. Michael Attaleiates von 1077* (Jena, 1894), described by Herman, p. 295, as a "breve ma accurata dissertazione."

granting monasteries to laymen.”³⁷ The *charistikion* was granted, in theory, to a layman in order that the latter might improve, for the benefit of his own soul, the monastic property which he thus took over. It seems likely, however, that the *charistikion* grew up within the Church itself, even before the iconoclastic period, possibly as a means of securing the services of certain laymen, who, like the western *advocatus* (*avoué*) or *vicedominus* (*vidame*), might be useful to the Church, especially for protection against foreign invaders or local marauders. The need for protection was notorious, at least from the eleventh century on. Piracy and brigandage were rewarding occupations for those who possessed so little hope or so much hardihood that the normal routines of life would not suffice.

Churches and monasteries were especially vulnerable to attack, and in time of trouble the strong arm of some local *archon* was better to lean upon than the pastoral staff. *Charistikarioi* owed protection, at least, to the monks dwelling in the monastic properties in their charge. According to John of Antioch, however, “if men were to allege that monasteries are thus granted for their own well being and long continuance, those monasteries immediately cry out in loud remonstrance which have been ruined by their *charistikarioi*, and there are no few of these, as well as those which have been converted by their holders into regular estates [*προάστεια*]. We do not know whether a single monastery can be found which has been restored and reestablished by its *charistikarios*.³⁸ A good deal of evidence, which need not detain us here, could be adduced to support both John of Antioch’s contentions and the indignation with which he enunciated them. A law (*prostaxis*) of Alexius I Comnenus, issued in December of the fifth indiction (i. e. 1082, 1097, or 1112), confirmed the patriarchal right of supervision over all monasteries, of whatsoever category, and required that those

³⁷ Ioann. Antioch., *De disciplina monastica et de monasteriis laicis non tradendis*, 6-7 (P. G., 132, cols. 1128 BC), and esp. cap. 8 (1129 B). There is a recent summary of some material relating to the *charistikion* in Peter Charanis, “Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, no. IV (1948), pp. 72-81.

³⁸ Ioann. Antioch., *De monasteriis laicis non tradendis*, 13 (P. G., 132, cols. 1136 D-1137 A). The *proasteia* (*προάστεια*) were ecclesiastical estates held by laymen on a less costly and exacting tenure than the *charistikia*: monks need not be supported, for example, on the *proasteia*.

who held monasteries as grants should not allow them to suffer any diminution of value.³⁹ The *charistikion*, however, must have served its purpose, for it possessed many defenders within the Church itself.

Although the *charistikion* had been annulled as an institution by the Patriarch Sisinnius II (996-998), and although some founders of monasteries in the eleventh and twelfth centuries provided in their deeds of gift that their foundations should not pass into the hands of *charistikarioi*, the Patriarch Sergius II in 1016 defended and reestablished the *charistikion*.⁴⁰ In his opinion it served worthwhile purposes. The Patriarch Alexius of Studium (1025-1043) presided over local synods in Constantinople in November of 1027 and in January of 1028, in which the whole practice of granting monasteries as *charistikia* was again considered in detail. While the customary abuses were again singled out for correction, the merits of the *charistikion* as such were sufficient in the eyes of the assembled fathers to earn their approbation, provided any grant in question had been made with proper patriarchal and other ecclesiastical authorization, and provided the Church retained ultimate control over the monastery: moreover, when episcopal and other churches were found to be impoverished, *charistikia* dependent upon them were to be revoked by the Holy Synod, so that such properties might be available for the support of the churches.⁴¹ This was a sensible

³⁹ *Prostaxis*, cited by Theodore Balsamon, *In can. xix Conc. VII Oecumen.*, in *P. G.*, 137, cols. 984 C-985; Rhalles and Potles, Σύνταγμα, II, p. 634; lines 21 ff.; J. and P. Zepos, *Jus Graeco-Romanum*, I, pp. 346-8; summary of the document in Franz Dölger, *Regesten d. Kaiserurkunden d. oströmischen Reiches*, pt. 2 (Munich and Berlin, 1925), no. 1076, pp. 25-6. The document is dated December of the fifth Indiction, which corresponds to the years 1082, 1097, and 1112 (cf. Adr. Cappelli, *Cronologia e Calendario perpetuo* [Milan, 1906], pp. 65-6), and so I do not know why Dölger, *loc. cit.*, has dated the document in 1081-1096-1111. In any event this document appears to belong to the year 1097 (cf. E. Herman, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VI [1940], p. 324, n.).

⁴⁰ Balsamon, *In can. xiii Conc. VII Oecumen.*, in *P. G.*, 137, cols. 956-957; Rhalles and Potles, II, pp. 613-14, doc. dated May of the fourteenth Indiction, i. e. 1016 (Cappelli, *Cronologia*, p. 63); V. Grumel, *Les Actes des Patriarches*, I, fasc. 2 (1936), no. 821, p. 242.

⁴¹ V. Grumel, *Les Actes des Patriarches*, I, fasc. 2, no. 833, pp. 248-9, and no. 835, secs. 12 ff., p. 251; texts in Rhalles and Potles, V, pp. 20 ff., 30-2, and *P. G.*, 119, cols. 837-44, 828-37. Cf. Ferdinand Chalandon,

decision, and it was not disputed by another synod which investigated the problem of the *charistikia*, at the behest of the Metropolitan of Cyzicus, in 1071, under the Patriarch John VIII Xiphilinus; it was again declared that grants of *charistikia* should be revoked when any alteration in the character of the tenure was to be feared, or when such grants deprived the mother church of needed revenue, but the institution, when serving its intended purpose, was apparently quite proper.⁴² The twelfth-century canonist Theodore Balsamon also defended the *charistikion*, that "useful custom of our blessed fathers," which had been improperly condemned and discontinued by the Patriarch Sisinnius II (996-998), and subsequently attacked by the Patriarch John V of Antioch, to whose views Balsamon took strong exception.⁴³

We may now turn to one of the most detailed and valuable documents which we have illustrating control by the Holy Synod of monasteries and other ecclesiastical properties granted as *charistikia* to the lay lessees known as *charistikarioi*. This document concerns the Church of Athens, which, as we shall see, had its full share of trouble with *charistikarioi*.

On 20 April, 1089, a synod in Constantinople, consisting of ten high ecclesiastics and some patriarchal officials (*despotikoi archontes*), under the Patriarch Nicholas III Grammaticus (1084-1111), acted upon a petition presented to it by the Athenian Metropolitan Nicetas III. Nicetas' predecessor, the Metropolitan John V Blachernites (d. 1086), had badly managed the affairs of the Athenian Church, and Nicetas now inquired of the holy synod whether numerous acts of John need be enforced that were "contrary to the laws, the divine canons, and even to ecclesiastical custom." The new Metropolitan of Athens asserted that the same synodal decrees should be applied to those who held the suburban estates (*πρόστεια*) of the Church,

Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Ier Comnène (1081-1118) (Paris, 1900), pp. 282 ff., and E. Herman, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VI (1940), pp. 320-1.

⁴² Th. I. Uspenskii, *Izv. russk. Arkh. Instit. v Kpole* (for full reference see, *infra*, note 44), V (1900), p. 23.

⁴³ Balsamon, *In can. xiii Conc. VII Oecumen.*, in *P. G.*, 137, cols. 956-7, esp. 956 C and 957 B; Rhalles and Potles, II, pp. 613-14; V. Grumel, *Les Actes des Patriarches*, I, fasc. 2, no. 809, pp. 236-7.

and other properties also, as were applied to that class of lessees who were not bound to pay rent (*χαριστικάριοι*), for the damage which they did to the interests of the Church was the same. It was decided that those who held monasteries and chapels (*μοναστήρια καὶ εὐκτήρια*) without maintaining therein monks, to tend to the divine service and to care for the property, were to be dispossessed, unless the Metropolitan himself wished to keep them, for a year or two, on condition that they should have monks in residence, take care of them properly, and make amends for any diminution in value the properties might have suffered during their tenancy. Likewise, those who held properties of the Church, acquired as donations (*κατὰ δωρεάν*) were to be dispossessed, for the alienation of church property is forbidden, except in an exchange which is to the advantage of the Church, and while such property can be leased, this too is permissible only when the Church receives a proper rent. Those who had received, as leaseholds (*τίτλῳ ἐκληπτορικῷ ή μισθωτικῷ*), lands, vineyards, mills, or the like, were to return them immediately if they held them on a twenty-year lease that had already been renewed (*ἡ ἐκληψις ἐπὶ δὶς κ'*), or on a lease of twenty-nine years' duration; but if the lease extended to twenty or twenty-seven years, attention was to be paid to this: if the lessees had worked the properties advantageously and if they had been paying a proper rent, they were to be left in possession, provided they continued to pay rent commensurate with the value of the property they held; but if those holding properties could not produce a written lease, they were to be removed therefrom, according to the law, without compensation for any improvements they might claim to have made. Nevertheless, if the lessees had dealt with the Church neither sharply nor deceptively, and if the improvements they had made exceeded in value the loss which their retention of the land had caused the Church, justice required that they should receive the difference.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ These synodal decisions of 20 April, 1089, concerning the lands and properties of the Church of Athens, are quoted in a document of decisions of 10 February, 1164, first published by Th. I. Uspenskii, "Mneniâ i postanovleniâ konstantinopolskikh pomestnykh soborov XI. i XII. vv. o razdache sherkovnykh imushchestv (kharistikarii)" ["Opinions and Decisions of the Synods of Constantinople, dealing with Land, in the XIth and XIIth Centuries, concerning the Disposition of Ecclesiastical Properties"], in the *Izv. russk. Arkh. Instit. v Kpole*

The Metropolitan Nicetas next took up the question of the lands and properties owned by the Church in the vicinity of Athens, and hence called *ἐνθύρια*, "things at the gates," many of which *enthuria* were then occupied, according to Nicetas, by some of the residents of the city of Athens and by other persons as well (*ώς πολλὰ παρ' ἐνίων οἰκητόρων τοῦ κάστρου καὶ λοιπῶν προσώπων κατέχονται*). The synod decided that, if the properties of which Nicetas spoke were really *enthuria*, they were to be returned to the Metropolitan Church of Athens with the coming harvest of the twelfth induction (1089), for if the twelfth canon of the Second Council of Nicaea (A. D. 787) ordered the restoration to churches of productive, self-maintaining properties, called *αὐτούργια*,⁴⁵ as indispensable to the welfare of the churches, so should the *enthuria*, being at the very gates, as it were, be held by the Church alone, as necessary for her maintenance and not that of any other person. Furthermore, the Metropolitan Nicetas claimed that in the region of Decelea, where the Athenian Church possessed "no few vineyards," lessees of such properties had rendered a tenth part of the wine produced to the Church as her share, but the Metropolitan John had leased all these places in Decelea for a few pieces of gold. The synod decided that the tithe of wine should be paid, as formerly, to the Church of Athens, and if the present lessees refused to pay

[the *Izvestiâ of the Russ. Arch. Institute in Constantinople*], V (Odessa, 1900), pp. 32-41, and for my text, above, see pp. 32-6; there is a summary of the document in V. Grumel, *Les Actes des Patriarches*, I, fasc. 3 (1947), no. 952, pp. 46-8; and it has been dealt with by Georg Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates, Metrop. von Athen*, in *Orientalia Christiana*, XXXIII-2 (1934), pp. 149-52. On the granting of ecclesiastical properties by bishops to laymen in Italy in the tenth and eleventh centuries, which produced problems not unlike those being faced by the Athenian and other Byzantine churches in the eleventh century, see Catherine E. Boyd, *Tithes and Parishes in Medieval Italy* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1952), *passim*, esp. pp. 92-102, where, for example, "in 1006 we find the bishop of Novara leasing for twenty-nine years half the lands of the parish of Anzola in return for a money rent" (*ibid.*, p. 99). Such leases of ecclesiastical lands, *livellario nomine*, were regularly made for a period not exceeding twenty-nine years (Boyd, *op. cit.*, p. 70). The connection between Byzantine and Italian land law was, of course, very close. Cf. also Franz Dölger, "Die Frage d. Grundeigentums in Byzanz," *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences*, V (1933), p. 7.

⁴⁵ On *autourgia*, cf. Balsamon, *In can. xiii Conc. VII Oecumen.*, in *P. G.*, 137, cols. 952 CD-953 A.

the tithe, they were to be dispossessed, but to receive compensation, in accord with the decision already reached, for the improvements which they might have made. The same provisions were laid down for the management of other Athenian properties—vineyards, arable lands, buildings, and mills—in the region of Thebes, and wherever the Athenian Church possessed immovable goods. The Metropolitan Nicetas also called the attention of the synod to the fact that monasteries belonging to the Athenian Church were in the hands of “certain lay persons of influence and of bishops too” (*τὰ παρά τινων δυνατῶν προσώπων λαϊκῶν τε καὶ ἐπισκόπων κατεχόμενα μοναστήρια*), who held them as “donations,” but that these should now revert to the Church, in accordance with a synodal decree of the Patriarch Alexius of Studium (1025-1043), to the effect that bishoprics which are prosperous, and possess monasteries given to them by their Metropolitans, should return these monasteries to the metropolitan sees if the latter are in need.⁴⁶ Here the synod replied that a copy of the Patriarch Alexius’ decree would be sent to the judge of the theme of Hellas and the Peloponnesus (*ὁ θεματικὸς δικαστής*),⁴⁷ so that such monasteries might be returned to the Church of Athens as she should be repossessed of, under this provision, just as obtained with regard to properties classified as *autourgia*. Finally, with the consideration of some other matters in which the Metropolitans of Crete and Mitylene had an interest, as well as the energetic Nicetas of Athens, and which involved an appeal to the Emperor, the synod concluded its session, and the patriarchal notary who recorded the minutes of the meeting had produced a document of much importance in the medieval history of Athens.⁴⁸

From the synodal decrees of 20 April, 1089, we perceive that the growing strength of the great landowners in Attica and Boeotia, the *dynatoi*, was derived in part, at least, from their acquisition of monasteries and other properties belonging to

⁴⁶ V. Grumel, *Les Actes des Patriarches*, I, fasc. 2 (1936), no. 833, sec. 5, p. 249, doc. dated November of 1027. See, *supra* n. 39.

⁴⁷ By the date of the present document (1089), Hellas and the Peloponnesus, originally two separate themes, had been combined to form a single theme under a praetor resident at Thebes (cf. Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates*, in *Orientalia Christiana*, XXXIII-2, p. 144).

⁴⁸ Uspenskii, *Izv. russk. Arkh. Inst. v Kpole*, V (1900), pp. 36-41; Grumel, *Les Actes des Patriarches*, I, fasc. 3 (1947), no. 952, p. 47.

the Church of Athens, and that the Metropolitan John had actually assisted their ambition by freely giving up monasteries to them, as well as to some of his suffragan bishops, who may not have been much easier to handle. The result was a decline in monastic life and organization, for the new proprietors, especially the lay magnates, did not concern themselves unduly about the monks, whom they were, of course, under a solemn obligation to maintain; but whom we have seen abandoning the monasteries, with a consequent neglect of the divine service and a failure to preserve the goods of the Church. But the Metropolitan John had dispatched the other properties of the Church with even greater magnanimity than his bestowal of monasteries upon improper recipients. He had almost given away various estates of the Church, either for no rent or for a rent too small, and even lands and properties close to Athens itself, the *enthuria*, which were particularly necessary to the Metropolitan and his cathedral staff, to help maintain the city churches, charities, perhaps a school, and the like. The *enthuria*, the synod decided, were to be administered directly by the Church. If the synodal decisions of 1089 were actually enforced, the economic conditions of the Athenian Church should have been much improved, for the Metropolitan laid claim to extensive properties. Besides the *enthuria*, especially valuable because of their close proximity to the city and the cathedral, there were other properties, which, when once developed, required no further expenditure of capital to maintain them—and called, therefore, *autourgia*, or “self-working”—such as salt works, vineyards, olive groves, pastures, mills, brick- and tile-works, and the like, which must have produced a good profit, in money and in kind, for the Metropolitan, the canons, churches, and charities. The vineyards in the region of Decelea, and the lands and properties in and around Thebes, were of particular value, and their administration by the Metropolitan John had apparently been particularly poor. Perhaps Nicetas did something to rectify the conditions of which he complained to the synod, but he could not impede the growth of the large estates nor moderate the ambition of their powerful owners. Three quarters of a century later, on 10 February, 1164, a holy synod, presided over by the Patriarch Lucas Chrysoberges (1157-1169/70), was asked by the Metropolitan Michael of Heraclea whether the leasing of

the valuable properties known as *enthuria* and *autourgia* had to be maintained through twice the period of the twenty-seven years, already forbidden in 1089; to the Metropolitan Michael the practice of leasing these properties seemed too old and well established to forbid any longer; the Patriarch and the synod declared invalid leases of ecclesiastical properties of more than twenty-seven years, as well as certain transferable leases; but they did not seek to condemn out of hand the custom of leasing the *enthuria* and the *autourgia*.⁴⁹ "The exposition of the canon law was also obliged to adjust itself to the irresistible economic development."⁵⁰

By the eleventh and twelfth centuries certain of the political and economic institutions of the western kingdoms and of the Byzantine Empire had come to possess, externally at least, some important similarities, and recent scholarship has shown that the Greek world into which the Latin Crusaders brought their concepts of fief and vassalage, manor and serfdom, was a world well prepared to understand importations from the west which were not so novel to the Greeks as some older historians had thought. The Latin and Greek worlds were not too far apart to understand each other, or, sometimes, deliberately to misunderstand each other. As the position of the western kings gradually increased in strength, and they slowly became aware, under clerical tutelage, of some of the implications of the charismatic authority they possessed, the position of the Byzantine Emperor was growing more and more precarious, even if he abated no whit the ceremonial pretensions of his God-given *basileia*. Several great Byzantine families were becoming threats to the Emperor, not merely because of their chances of attaining to the imperial throne on the roulette of armed revolution—which had made the successful Leo the Armenian an Emperor and the unsuccessful Thomas the Slavonian a criminal, and so on—

⁴⁹ Uspenskii, *Izv. russk. Arkh. Inst. v Kpole*, V (1900), pp. 30-2, 41-2; Grumel, *Les Actes des Patriarches*, I, fasc. 3 (1947), no. 1055, p. 117; Ioannes Oudot, ed., *Patriarchatus Constantinopolitanus Acta Selecta* (Sacra Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale: *Codificazione Canonica Orientale: Fonti*, ser. II, fasc. III), I (Vatican Press, 1941), doc. IV, pp. 30-3.

⁵⁰ Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates*, in *Orient. Christiana*, XXXIII-2 (1934), p. 152.

but also because of the vast holdings these families possessed, putting them in rather the same relation to the Emperor as the heads of the houses of Flanders and Champagne, for examples, stood to the King of France. In the generation preceding the year 1204 the power of the Byzantine Emperor had been rapidly diminishing; the power of the western monarchs, especially the King of France, had been increasing. Feudalism had arisen in western Europe out of chaos, in the absence of strong central government; feudalism grew, in the eleventh century, in the Byzantine Empire, as the Emperor ceased to be strong; various magnates now began to usurp, especially on the periphery of the Empire, public functions and services which the state was obliged to relinquish from weakness. Feudalism is the negation of the concept of the state; it means the assumption of public authority by private individuals; it means the end of any distinction between public and private law; it replaces the relationship between subject and sovereign, between citizen and state, by an infinity of private contracts and bargains designed to produce security and a livelihood for persons both high and low. The west was now recovering from the social disintegration which had grown out of the breakdown of the Carolingian Empire, and so feudalism was ceasing to be either necessary or possible; the eastern Empire was experiencing the failure which its western counterpart had known some three and a half centuries before. Nicetas Choniates says that, during the two decades of the disastrous rule of the Angeli (1185-1204), "there were those who revolted in one place or another, again and again, and it is not possible to say how many times this happened"—*ἄλλοι ἄλλοτε πάλιν καὶ πάλιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁσάκις εἰπεῖν, ἐπανέστησαν*.⁵¹ Thus, feudalism, long delayed, made its inevitable appearance in the Byzantine world. As the west was increasing in power, the east was failing; at the time of the First and Second Crusades, east and west may appear more or less in equipoise; but the Fourth Crusade revealed how far the process of corrosion had gone in the Byzantine state.

The absorption of the small estates by the great landowners had undermined the strength of Byzantium. The small peasant freeholds had been an abundant source of revenue to the govern-

⁵¹ Nic. Chon., *De Isaacio Angelo*, III, 2 (Bonn, p. 553).

ment; the military estates had supported the imperial soldiery, native armies with their roots in Byzantine soil. The victory of the great landowners had been the defeat of the Byzantine central administration which had aided the Emperors in their opposition to the continued growth of the large estates; once highly organized, a beautifully functioning machine, this administration had seldom failed the Empire from the time of Heraclius to that of Basil II. It had known when to make peace and when to fight, but now it had been irreparably damaged. In August of 1071 a mercenary army had gone down at Manzikert, and had pulled the Emperor down with it.⁵² Earlier in the same year Bari had fallen to Robert Guiscard, who now extinguished the last embers of Byzantine authority in Italy, and began his attacks upon the Empire. A decade later, in 1081, Alexius I Comnenus came to the imperial throne, a great landowner, and the champion of the military aristocracy in Asia Minor; relying for support upon the magnates who had assisted his rise to the purple, he abandoned for a time the imperial opposition, generations old, to the magnates' own social and economic aggrandizement; Alexius ceased to supply any effective protection to the small free peasant in his proprietary rights to the land he cultivated; the imperial government, until the end of the vigorous reign of Basil II Bulgaroctonus (976-1025), had commonly resisted, as we have seen, the magnates' encroachment upon the small freeholds of the peasantry, upon which a large burden of taxation had fallen, and from which most of the army had been recruited.⁵³ In the middle of the eleventh century, in the reign of the weak Constantine IX Monomachus (1042-1054), comes what appears to be the first clear reference to the *pronoia*, the

⁵² See Claude Cahen, "La Campagne de Mantzikert," *Byzantion*, IX (1934), pp. 628-42, and on the now polyglot armies of Byzantium, cf. Ferdinand Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Ier Comnène (1081-1118)* (Paris, 1900), pp. 75-7 and the learned notes by H. Grégoire and R. de Keyser, in *Byzantion*, XIV (1939), pp. 280-3.

⁵³ Cf. Georg Ostrogorsky, "Die Entwicklungsgrundlagen d. byzant. Reiches," V. S. W. G., XXII (1929), pp. 136-8; Vasiliev, *Byzantion*, VIII (1933), pp. 601 ff. (Alexius I was obliged, after he was safely established on the throne, to oppose the large landowners, and the last member of his dynasty, Andronicus I [1183-1185] took vigorous measures against them.) Cf. G. Stadtmüller, *Neue Jahrb. f. deutsche Wissenschaft*, XIII (1937), pp. 431-3.

Byzantine fief, as a grant of land or of some other source of income by the Emperor, in return for military service.⁵⁴ The institution is probably older than this. The *pronoia* becomes an almost predominant aspect of Byzantine social organization from the close of the eleventh century.⁵⁵ The magnates, *dynatoi*, now secured for themselves ever larger estates by marriage and by purchase, as well as by various forms of peaceful and violent usurpation. With the decline of efficiency in the central government it was no longer possible to prevent this growth of *latifundia*, although it is true that some efforts were made to do so; however, the Emperor himself often quickened the process of concentrating larger holdings in fewer hands by grants of *pronoiai*. Holders of *pronoiai* rendered military service, and other kinds of service, to the Emperor in accordance with the size and conditions of their grant. In this way, increasingly, were the military forces of the Empire supplied—and also, of course, by mercenaries—and the magnates tended to acquire some of the functions of local government, the inevitable consequence of feudalism. These were probably necessary developments in view of the decline in the state's ability to collect taxes and so pay for the performance of public services. The holders of imperial *pronoiai* acquired large numbers of dependents: the peasants on an estate granted as a *pronoia* were the tenants (*paroikoi*) of the magnate thus enfeoffed (the *pronoetes*). The *paroikoi* paid for the parcels of land they held in rent and by their work on the lord's demesne; they might not be legally, as in the Roman and early Byzantine colonate, "adscript to the

⁵⁴ The earliest Byzantine reference to the *pronoia* as such seems to come under the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus (1042-1054), for which see John Skylitzes, *Excerpta*, in Geo. Cedrenus, *Hist. compendium* (Bonn, II, p. 645, lines 1-2); also in John Zonaras, *Epit.*, XVIII, 5, 9 (Bonn, III, p. 670); and cf. Michael Attaliates, *Hist.* (Bonn, p. 200, line 22). Cf. Franz Dölger, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXVI (1926), pp. 105-9, and E. Herman, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, VI (1940), pp. 373-4, n.

⁵⁵ Cf. Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XXII, p. 139; *idem*, *Cambr. Ec. Hist.*, I, pp. 215-16; and Darkó, *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, V (1939), pp. 96-7. For details see also Ostrogorsky's recent studies on "Le Système de la *pronoia*," in the *Actes du VI^e Congrès international d'études byzantines*, I, pp. 181-9, and especially *Das Pronoia System: Beitrag z. Gesch. d. Feudalismus in Byzanz u. d. südslawischen Ländern* [in Serbian with German summary] (Belgrade, 1951).

glebe," but it was doubtless easy for the lord to secure the full payment of such money and labor as his tenants owed him, and the distinction between western serfs, of so many grades and different conditions, and the *paroikoi* on these Byzantine estates would be more often of ultimate legal than of more immediate social significance. The *allelengyon* (*ἀλληλέγγυον*) had been abolished in the time of the Emperor Romanus III Argyrus (1028-1034), as we have noted, and an important source of revenue, once paid by the small freeholders, was lost to the treasury. It was an ill-conceived tax, and Byzantium was better off without it. The taxes were already being farmed out, always a costly and wasteful device, and almost invariably the hallmark of an inefficient government.⁵⁶ The very measures which were meant to secure the collection of taxes and to provide for the defense of the state operated actually to loosen still further the bonds of society and to diminish the confidence of all classes in the strength of the central government and in the good faith of its provincial administrators. Finally, like his predecessor Nicephorus III Botaniates (1078-1081), the Emperor Alexius I debased the coinage, and encouraged an *Inflationspolitik*, with its inevitable concomitants of high prices and shortages of goods.⁵⁷

The Byzantine *pronoiai*, or "fiefs," were held directly of the

⁵⁶ Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 66-7 (note). As for the attachment of the Byzantine *paroikos* to the soil, it should be observed that according to a much-discussed law of the Emperor Anastasius (491-518), a summary of which appears in the *Code Justinian*, lib. XI, tit. 48 [47], 19, the peasant who occupied a piece of land for thirty years became a *colonus* (*μισθωτός*), and so could neither leave nor be evicted from the land thereafter, a provision of the law which we find still in force in the thirteenth century (cf. Charanis, *Byzantinoslavica*, XII, pp. 135-9).

⁵⁷ Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, pp. 66, 69-70, and Stein, *Mitteilungen zur osman. Gesch.*, II (1923-1926), p. 11. Alexius I debased the gold *nomisma*, previously worth 12 silver *miliarisia*, to one-third of its value (i. e. 4 *mil.*), insisting upon the payment of obligations to the state in money of full weight. The following table of the most important Byzantine coinage values may be useful (from Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XX, p. 63):

1 gold pound = 72 *nomismata*

1 *nomisma* = 12 *miliarisia* = 24 *keratia* = 288 *folleis*

1 *miliarision* = 2 *keratia* = 24 *folleis*

1 *keration* = 12 *folleis*.

Emperor. They were revocable at the death of the holder, but tended to become hereditary in the fourteenth century. They were not regranted, as in western subinfeudation, but they possessed much in common with the western fief; commonly grants of land, the chief source of wealth in this society, the *pronoiai* might also consist in grants of certain tolls, fishing rights, salt works, and the like. The Crusader felt at home in the Byzantine Empire. The Emperor Manuel Comnenus had granted a *pronoia* near Thessalonica to the family of Montferrat, probably to Nerio of Montferrat when he married the Emperor's daughter, and a quarter of a century later his brother Boniface, on the Fourth Crusade, referred to it as his *feudum*. This is the classic equation of the *pronoia* with the western *feudum*, but in late Byzantine documents the *pronoia* is actually called a "fief" (*φεῦδα*), and the *pronoetes* has become a "liege and knight" (*λίξιος καὶ καβαλλάριος*).⁵⁸

Under the weak dynasty of the Angeloi (1185-1204), feudalism, with some rather strong ecclesiastical elements, became almost the predominant fact in the political and social organization of the Byzantine Empire. Andronicus I Comnenus had tried, in his brief reign (1183-1185), to halt the final absorption of small freeholds by the large landowners. His efforts were futile; it was now too late; the era of the Fourth Crusade was soon to come. The Byzantine practice of patronage (*prostasia*), not wholly unlike western commendation; the grants of immunity from financial and judicial responsibilities to the state (*exkousseiai*), made to ecclesiastical, especially monastic, and even to lay landowners; and the lay use of ecclesiastical properties (the

⁵⁸ Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, IV, 81 (doc. of the year 1251), *et alibi*. Cf. Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XXII, p. 139; *idem*, *Cambr. Ec. Hist.*, I, p. 216; Vasiliev, *Byzantium*, VIII, pp. 591, 601; John Danstrup, "The State and Landed Property in Byzantium," in *Classica et Mediaevalia*, VIII, p. 229; D. A. Zakythinos, *Crise monétaire et crise économique à Byzance du XIII^e au XV^e siècle* (Athens, 1948), p. 52. Although grants were made establishing full proprietary ownership in the grantee in earlier Byzantine times, and so were heritable, it is only from the time of Michael VIII Palaeologus (1259-1282) that such grants became numerous; from the early fourteenth century on the heritability of *pronoiai*, "fiefs," is common (cf. Ostrogorsky, *Actes du VI^e Congrès international d'études byzantines*, I, pp. 186-7, and Charanis, *Byzantinoslavica*, XII, pp. 104-6, *et passim*).

charistikia) were all institutions in which parallelisms between east and west either existed or could be assumed for the purposes of practical procedure in the year 1204.⁵⁹ The Fourth Crusaders thus found the land of Greece almost as well prepared for the implantation of their feudal institutions as its mountainous terrain proved to be suited to the construction of their feudal castles.

KENNETH M. SETTON.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

⁵⁹ A. A. Vasiliev, "On the Question of Byzantine Feudalism," *Byzantium*, VIII (1933), pp. 587, 589-95; Ostrogorsky, *V. S. W. G.*, XXII, pp. 139-40.

DISCOLOR AURA.

REFLECTIONS ON THE GOLDEN BOUGH.

Vergil's golden bough is one of the crucial images of the *Aeneid*. In it the poet catches up plot and hero into one of those knots of meaning which unify the poem. The importance of the bough is universally allowed; its significance is not. The depth and multiplicity of meaning which it provides have served too often to lead away from the image, and the poem, instead of toward them. Commentators have followed the threads of reference rather than the threads of suggestion. What they have found relates to the more or less distant environment of the *Aeneid*, to tradition, belief, and ritual, which must be considered in the interpretation of the poem, but which cannot constitute that interpretation, or even begin it. The oak-spirit and the King of the Wood, the mistletoe and the Queen of the Dead are all impressive concepts. But if the "real meaning" of the golden bough lies in these or near them, then Vergil must be considered an artist after the fashion of the late David Belasco, who painted the back of his stage sets as well as the front. What is actually happening on the stage or in the poem we may suspect to be illusory or subsidiary; the real action may be taking place in the carefully prepared but invisible recesses of the scene, approachable only by those who have a pass backstage. This is not Vergil's method, and least of all could it be his at this point in the development of the *Aeneid*.

The Sixth Book is the center of the poem, symbolically as well as literally. The journey to Italy is over; the war has not yet begun. It is the still point between the two fields of action postulated for the hero in the first words of the poem, between the predominantly individual experience of the man, and the predominantly social experience of arms. In this pause, the destiny which frames the hero in both his worlds, as son and as city-ancestor, is supernaturally consummated. But to encounter both father and race, past and future, is an experience of terror, in fact of death. It can only take place in another world whose perceptions envelop, confuse, and sometimes deny the validity

of the life-experience on earth. The underworld and all the images that go with it are demanded by the necessities of the poem. They are neither intruded upon Vergil by convention nor lightly used by him for mystification and "atmosphere." Every passage in the book is a new and integral perception of what has gone before, and an ineluctable framing of what is to come. There is no place here for tricks of staging, for external matter half-hidden, in one scholar's phrase, by "a haze of poetry." It is not only possible, but necessary, to view the golden bough as part of the *Aeneid*'s structure, to evolve its meaning primarily from its context and from what Vergil says about it, not from what we know or he may have known about its origins.

Sic fatur lacrimans. The Fifth Book passes instantly into the Sixth, from Aeneas' words to the tears which accompany them. No other passage from book to book in the *Aeneid* provides so little pause.¹ Throughout the earlier books Aeneas has been prepared to confront the underworld; now he is almost hurried to the encounter. After a moment's pause before the Daedalian doors of the temple at Cumae, the prologue begins. Spatially it has an elaborate development in the penetration of one recess after another.² The hero passes from chamber to chamber, to

¹ Servius' account of the passage indicates Vergil's method of connecting the two books. See E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI* (3rd ed., Leipzig and Berlin, 1934), pp. 110-11.

² The theories of W. F. Jackson Knight, *Cumaean Gates* (Oxford, 1936), and of R. W. Cruttwell, *Virgil's Mind at Work* (London, 1946), concerning the symbolism of the temple doors need attention here. Knight's work was not available to me (except indirectly through reviews), but both authors apparently see a symbolic reference to the rites of initiation and the tortuous passage to the underworld in the labyrinth carved by Daedalus upon the doors. This view seem particularly appropriate to the formal ritual pattern and to the progress from level to level which forms the rest of the prologue. Unfortunately I feel that the labyrinth image is not intrinsically important to Vergil. It is one of a series which passes in quick review the whole Cretan episode; it bears no more weight than Pasiphae or the Minotaur and considerably less than Icarus. The enormous breadth of parallels adduced by Knight and Cruttwell may possibly convince one of an archetypal image working below Vergil's consciousness, but Vergil's mind at work is not necessarily at work upon his poetry. Their interpretation is cabalistic, not symbolic; it involves too many secret keys to be applicable as criticism.

the temple, the Sibyl's cave, the grove of the bough, and finally the underworld itself. His progress is cast by Vergil into the rhythmic structure of ritual. It opens with a sacrifice to Apollo, and proceeds to the two prayers of Aeneas, which are answered in turn by the priestess as god and the priestess as mortal. Both exchanges are balanced again by the two tasks which they impose upon Aeneas, the finding of the bough and the burial of *Misenus*. The great sacrifice to the gods of the dead closes the prologue as it began, and hastens the hero into the kingdom of *Dis*.

The prologue-rite, like others, conveys meaning beyond and through its formal structure. The movement, words, and action of Aeneas not only bring him from the doors of Daedalus to the jaws of hell, but convey him from one level of existence to another. Objectively he passes from life to death, subjectively from the impotent and chaotic perceptions of mortality to a power over himself and the world which barely falls short of being ultimate knowledge as well. The book opens with Aeneas' futile and ignorant lament for *Palinurus*; at the end of the prologue he has come to command, at least temporarily, his own fate, both social and personal. Within the frame of ritual, Aeneas' experience of the past and his will for the future, "memory and desire," meet and are unified. For the first time in the poem there is a total realization of the central character. It is this inner progress which is really necessary for the mysterious journey.

An external agent, the Sibyl, guides the hero throughout. Far more than any person so far introduced in the poem, even Aeneas himself, she would be to the Roman a figure of history and authenticity. With the coming of Aeneas to Italy the heroic world, Greek and Trojan, begins to be absorbed into the Roman-historical sphere, and this process continues throughout the latter half of the poem. The Sibyl is the first agent and representative of the change. But she is more than a type of Roman religious authority; Vergil portrays her as a personality, after a popular tradition which is far wider than Rome. Like the witch-concealed divinity familiar in folk-tale, in fact like the mysterious woman who bargained the Sibylline books away to *Tarquin*, she accosts the hero abruptly, even abusively, but proves his helper and guide:

non hoc ista sibi tempus spectacula poscit.

Equipped with the pragmatic folk-wisdom of such figures, as well as with the prestige of Rome, she acts as foil to Aeneas, historical against heroic, social against individual, and consequently "real" and skeptical in the face of the inner experience of the hero.

She demands his prayers, and he asks first for his people—*Latia consider Teucros*. This is the collective destiny, to be followed in the second prayer by individual experience, relations, and will. They are not to remain as *Teucri*, however. After a cento of reminiscences from the previous wanderings, with a suggestion of divine responsibility for his erratic course as well as for his safety, Aeneas asks for an end (62):

hac Troiana tenus fuit fortuna secuta.

The society of the heroic past must be wholly removed, for Troy survives only as a curse that drives him on. He prays for a consummation of that death announced by Panthus in the Second Book (325-6):

fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens
gloria Teucrorum,

using the same utterance of finality (VI, 64-5):

dique deaeque omnes, quibus obstitit Ilium et ingens
gloria Dardaniae. . . .

For the new birth of his people, new temples and new oracles are vowed. Aeneas speaks here as the leader, the fore-shadow of Augustus. But he is answered with the agony of the Roman Sibyl, and finally with the mouth of the god. His journey will end as it began, in the convulsion of war. Only on the other side of that cycle is peace and *salus*.

Of course this answer is not enough, for us or for the poet. It is a crisis in that peculiar dualism which is the essence of the *Aeneid*. Vergil spares us no hindsight throughout; Rome and the ancestor-hero of Rome are brought forth at every turn in the proper attitudes of piety and consummation. But opposed to these axioms of success is a complex series of incongruities in speech, character, and action, which are fully as important to the structure of the poem. It seems that the poet has no intention of fulfilling the comfortable expectations which he himself creates. The story of the *Aeneid* is a continual evasion of necessities.

The chain of history is already forged. Success is foreordained. But its nature, and the struggle which achieves it, are not, and this indeterminate quality presses continually upon the accepted order of things, forcing it into new and strange aspects. We are compelled to ask whether Aeneas is really achieving anything, whether Rome is really the crown of his destiny. At this point in the poem the incongruity between fact and attitude, history and the individual, emerges in the plainest manner. Now of all times the destiny which lies beyond peace and *salus* demands expression, and does not receive it. It is not only the narrative which creates this impression—a request for settlement and a new society is answered with a prophecy of war—but the undercurrent of images reinforces the denial. Upon the conclusive and orderly phrases of Aeneas' speech, the prophetic certainty of the Palatine temple and the Sibylline priests, follow the animal frenzy and ominous obscurity of the Sibyl. The result of the contrast is an acute tension between the poet-observer and the hero, between the historical order which is the fact and frame of our existence, and the individual who struggles painfully and fallibly toward its realization.

Relief follows, but again not in the expected pattern. The second prayer of Aeneas and its consequences bring him to a fulfilment, and eventually to the revelation which we demand. But the route is devious; the corporate destiny lies deeper than the Sibyl's cave, and before it is uncovered the individual soul must be prepared. This inner attainment is the function of his second request to the Sibyl. Significantly, before he makes it, she becomes again the human *vates*, instead of the mouthpiece of the god (102) :

ut primum cessit furor et rabida ora quierunt.

He puts aside the *horrida bella* which he as leader of his people must direct and suffer (105-6) :

omnia praecepi, atque animo mecum ante peregi.
unum oro—

and his prayer is not for further revelation of some divine purpose which lies behind them. Instead (108-9) :

ire ad conspectum cari genitoris et ora
contingat.

He asks for and at the same time reveals a completion of his own nature. *Pius Aeneas*, until now, has been another of those apparent norms of the poem which are formally insisted upon and substantially evaded. Aeneas has been dutifully subordinate to his father while alive—and continually frustrated in knowledge and action by this pious position. In Troy it is the vision of doom and terror, *dirae facies*, which is given to him; Anchises and Iulus, the generations on either side of him are vouchsafed the divine signs of safety (the flame) and hope (the shooting star). His father's panic loses him Creusa; his father's misreading of the oracle leads him to the false home in Crete. In all this the son of course says nothing of blame, or, more important, of love; he merely follows and suffers. It is Vergil's presentation of the relationship which creates the tension, and quietly corrodes the traditional formalities of *pietas*. The poet comes closest to being explicit, through the mouth of Aeneas, in the central episode of the Third Book. After meeting Helenus and Andromache, Aeneas, privately speaking to his seer-cousin, shows himself for once pragmatic and hopeful (III, 362-8) :

fare age (namque omnis cursum mihi prospera dixit
religio et cuncti suaserunt numine divi
Italiam petere et terras temptare repostas
.....) quae prima pericula vito?
quidve sequens tantos possim superare labores?

But after the colloquy Anchises and Iulus reenter the scene. His divinely certified family closes in upon him, receives further encouragement for the future, and Aeneas sinks to the contrary mood of despair (III, 493-6) :

vivite felices, quibus est fortuna peracta
iam sua; nos alia ex aliis in fata vocamur.
vobis parta quies, nullum maris aequor arandum
arva neque Ausoniae semper cedentia retro
quaerenda.

Nothing that Helenus has said would change Italy from a land hidden but accessible to the obedient hero, to a phantom receding before his search. The alteration is subjective, and by it Vergil associates Anchises with a feeling of futility and oppression. Aeneas is the fate-driven man; but in the presence of his family

he realizes that it is not his own fate which is driving him. After death, in the Fourth Book, Anchises continues to oppress his son. Throughout the idyll at Carthage, not once, like Mercury, but every night (351-3) :

me patris Anchisae, quotiens umentibus umbris
nox operit terras, quotiens astra ignea surgunt,
admonet in somnis et turbida terret imago.

Here, then, in the Sixth Book, *pietas* is still ambiguous at best. Anchises' shade has already commanded Aeneas to descend to the lower world, and we can expect no more than the dutiful response. But to respond so at this point and in these words connotes much more than duty :

ire ad conspectum cari genitoris et ora.

The vision of Anchises is substituted for the vision of Rome. Expression and cadence recall the first mention of his father in the Second Book: impelled by the blood of Priam and the fires of Troy (560) :

subiit cari genitoris imago.

This first rush of love and anxiety, the reaction of the natural unfated man, is at last fulfilled here. The intervening frustrations, springing from the double pressures of fate and parental authority, are erased. Anchises in Aeneas' eyes is no longer *sancte parens*, the dominant and divine old man, but helpless and pitiable, his journey viewed here for the first time in purely human terms (112-14) :

ille meum comitatus iter maria omnia mecum
atque omnis pelagique minas caelique ferebat
invalidus, viris ultra sortemque senectae.

The revelation of destiny follows, not because he asks for it, but because by this act of the personal will he has shown himself worthy.

This is not a complete resolution (there is none in the *Aeneid*) : the tension between knowledge and ignorance, history and the individual, is not so easily discharged. But Aeneas' speech, catching up together the levels of his experience, gives him a power found nowhere else in the poem. His particular

excellence, the heroism of obligation, reaches its summit here, in the act of going down to death.

The Sibyl's second reply, like the first, runs counter to the tone of Aeneas' request. She speaks here above all as the folk-seer, the primitive skeptic who finds reality only in the tangible, the apparent world. She says little of Anchises, and observes the inner consummation of Aeneas with a cold eye, seeing only, from the outside, the antithesis of life and death which he presents. Her speech parodies, somewhat cruelly, the solemn words of the hero. He has addressed her as the guardian of hell's gate, which indeed she is (106-9) :

quando hic inferni ianua regis
dicitur.....
.....doceas iter et sacra ostia pandas.

But she answers, with an intentional misunderstanding which is almost mockery, that the gates of hell are not guarded at all (126-7) :

facilis descensus Averno:
noctes atque dies patet atri ianua Ditis.

Anyone may die; there is no need to ask her for permission. But to pass through the kingdom of death and still remain alive, that is a fearful task even for those who boast of their divine descent. She forces us and the hero to recognize the enormity of his request. His *κατάβασις* is not to be an Odyssean adventure, but an equivalent performance of the real death-journey.

Later in her speech, the paradox is put as sharply as possible (133-5) :

quod si tantus amor menti, si tanta cupido est
bis Stygios innare lacus, bis nigra videre
Tartara. . .

The first line recognizes the subjective experience of Aeneas. *Amor* is the transcendent condition of *pietas* at which he has finally arrived. By one of Vergil's continual echoes, the phrase immediately recalls *sed si tantus amor* in the Second Book. The connection is deep and illuminating. This is another yielding of the self to share with another an extraordinary and terrible experience. In the earlier book Dido was to share with Aeneas the disaster of his city, the death of his race. Here Aeneas is to

share with Anchises an end even beyond this, the death of the individual.

But the object of *amor* which the Sibyl perceives is neither the one stated by Aeneas (the union with Anchises), nor the enlargement of personality implied by this line. She emphasizes the cold and fearful fact of death, not the attitude which leads Aeneas to accept the experience. The two crossings of the Styx come of course from the *Odyssey* (XII, 21-2): Vergil's line, though, is more concrete, and significantly different in its position. Circe speaks thus to Odysseus and his crew *after* they return from the underworld. They realize their action in retrospect. Here Aeneas must know that his mission will be the death-journey *before* he undertakes it. It is the immediate condition of his love and life.

The Sibyl, always the folk-wise observer, gives this union of opposites no encouragement. The line which follows expresses a curious contempt (135):

et insano iuvat indulgere labori.

The verbs suggest laxness and pleasure; joined with *insano* the phrase makes of Aeneas' request something almost indecent, to the Sibyl's pragmatism, and certainly unnatural. It is *amor* perverted. If it is to succeed, there must be a sign.

So, suddenly, we come upon the golden bough (136-48; 200-11):

latet arbore opaca
aureus et foliis et lento vimine ramus,
Iunoni infernae dictus sacer; hunc tegit omnis
lucus et obscuris claudunt convallibus umbrae.
sed non ante datur telluris opera subire
auricomos quam qui decerpserit arbore fetus.
hoc sibi pulchra suum ferri Proserpina munus
instituit. primo avulso non deficit alter
aureus, et simili frondescit virga metallo.
ergo alte vestiga oculis et rite repertum
carpe manu; namque ipse volens facilisque sequetur,
si te fata vocant; aliter non viribus ullis
vincere nec duro poteris convellere ferro.

* * *

inde ubi venere ad fauces grave olentis Averni,
tollunt se celeres liquidumque per aera lapsae

sedibus optatis geminae super arbore sidunt,
 discolor unde auri per ramos aura refusit.
 quale solet silvis brumali frigore viscum
 fronde virere nova, quod non sua seminat arbos,
 et croceo fetu teretis circumdare truncos,
 talis erat species auri frondentis opaca
 ilice, sic leni crepitabat brattea vento.
 corripit Aeneas extempsu avidusque refringit
 cunctantem, et vatis portat sub tecta Sibyllae.

Within the frame which I have tried to outline, we approach this extraordinary image. Clearly, there is in it an element of the external. Vergil reached beyond the world of his poem for a fact or belief or tradition which existed independent of his own imagination. Despite many conjectures it appears equally clear that we shall never trace down the referent in specific terms. Servius suggested the rites of Proserpina, and interjected that famous *publica opinio* about the grove of Nemi which was to lead Frazer forth on his massive pursuit of the tree-spirit and the sacrificial king. Heyne suggested, among other origins, the golden apples of Juno and the Hesperides, the pomegranate of Proserpina, the branch of the suppliant, the *aurea virga* of Mercury as psychagogue, and the Golden Fleece.³ Conington thought of the mysteries of Isis.⁴ Frazer ended with the derivation of the bough from folk beliefs concerning the properties of the mistletoe.⁵ Norden too approached the image through the mistletoe simile, but added the concept of the bough of myrtle or olive brought as a gift to the goddess Proserpina/Kore and as a symbol of life and rebirth in the mystery rituals.⁶

The diversity of conclusions does not result from any lack of diligence. No amount of searching, in literature or anthropology, will ever arrive at a single incontrovertible "answer," and this does not greatly matter. For whatever lies behind the bough-image lies also behind and outside the *Aeneid*. The golden bough of the *Aeneid* means exactly what Vergil, in his enormously

³ C. G. Heyne and G. P. E. Wagner, edd., *Publius Vergilius Maro* (4th ed., Leipzig, 1833), II, pp. 1014-15.

⁴ J. Conington, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (London, 1884), II, p. 426.

⁵ J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, Part VII, *Balder the Beautiful* (3rd ed., London, 1913), II, pp. 279-303.

⁶ Norden, *Aeneis VI*,³ pp. 163-75.

complex and allusive way, says that it means, no less and no more; in other words, it means what it is in the poem. None of the conjectures, therefore, which relate ultimately to the circumstances of the poem, and of the poet, should be entertained until the internal progress, the organic coherence of Vergil's imagination, has been examined. The point is universal. The creative product is never a logical and predictable result of its environment. The necessities and sequences of poetry are its own; if they are considered as fully explicable in terms of external statement—historical, philosophical, religious, or critical—poetry is destroyed. Because this image has received such a vast burden of attention from this external point of view, it is one of the critical points at which the nature of poetry must be maintained.

The poet has presented life and death, both as opposites, in the wisdom of the Sibyl, and as union, in the will of Aeneas. The human actors have reached the impasse of inner experience and outward observation, two irreconcilable aspects of reality. The golden bough is the necessary and external sign demanded to resolve the antinomy, and bears a fundamental relation to it. Let us take, for the present, the bough in its simplest aspect as a thing of gold. It grows in a dense tree, like the mistletoe, on an oak. It exists on a living thing, the last outpost in fact of the live world before the stinking jaws of Death. But the bough is made of gold—therefore it is not itself alive. It does have the semblance of a living branch; it grows leaves—*frondescit*—but always *simili metallo*. This flowering is denied the accustomed tissues of the kingdom of life. When the breeze catches the bough, *crepitabat brattea vento*. The line obviously represents sound, and by no stretch of the auditory imagination could it be the sound or motion of any living thing. The gold takes its meaning from the tree on which it grows, and the essential purpose of the image, resolving symbolically the conflict between Aeneas and the Sibyl, is to create a contrast between living and dead which is at the same time a vital union. The idea is grandly developed again by Aeneas (195-6):

derigit in lucos ubi pinguem dives opacat
ramus humum.

The epithets both signify wealth, but one connotes the abundance of the life-giving earth, while the other casts upon it the shadow

of a different splendor. This too, the sense of alien things in union, is the first significance of the mistletoe simile, and the contrasts in the simile itself, winter and growth, tree and parasite, emphasize the division.

Aeneas, in fulfilling his own life, must pass into death. He is not merely to see the underworld, but to undergo an analogue, dangerously close to reality, of his ultimate death-journey. The Sibyl, essential and external seer, observes this paradox with some disbelief. Life-in-death contravenes the natural order of mortality. If Aeneas' will is to become the exceptional reality, a sign of success is demanded. That sign is the golden bough; death-in-life. The magic is allopathic; the two strange unions complement each other and together complete an invulnerable circle which transcends nature. The bough becomes a guarantee both of Aeneas' ability to enter the underworld and of his protection while passing through it. Not only Aeneas and the bough, then, but his action upon the bough and the consequent journey are reciprocal symbols. As he plucks the bough from the tree, death from life, so he departs from the underworld unharmed, life from death.

The bough appears again at the crossing of the Styx (405-10), where the contrast of living and dead is most explicitly marked and the anomalous position of Aeneas is challenged (by Charon's recognition of a live soul, by the boat sinking under his weight). Finally he leaves the *munus* at the palace of Dis and Proserpina (628-36). This is the center of the triple scheme of the underworld. First Aeneas encounters the traditional Hades, then the vision of hell and heaven, Tartarus and Elysium, and finally the prophetic cycle of the souls and ages. Between the two elements of the central vision is the palace of the infernal king and queen, and the end of the bough's journey. It is no longer needed; the dangerous death-passage is ended (through the hopelessness of Aeneas' own mortal experience, through the eternity of evil), and the journey into life, indeed to something beyond life, is about to begin. *Largior hic aether*; Elysium is a different world.

The essence of the golden bough is the contrast between its lifeless nature and its organic environment. But we cannot stop here. Obviously the image of gold must express other relevant associations; otherwise lead or iron or stone would have done

equally well. These are not, however, the associations which have generally been conjectured for it—those of Pindar, for instance, for whom gold is a constantly recurrent symbol of glory and power.⁷ We look in vain in Vergil's lines for an unequivocal expression of brilliance, glory, or life as inherent in the golden bough. Rather, the first words give the key: *latet arbore opaca*. The bough is hidden by tree and forest; the hero cannot find it without supernatural guidance. Once it is plucked it is hidden again in the garments of the Sibyl (406). It enables Aeneas to descend to the "hidden places of the earth." This is not like the worked gold which is displayed as the emblem of wealth and splendor, but rather suggests the rare metal which must be sought in the depths of darkness and the earth. The *aureus ramus* is a secret, symbolically buried as well as lifeless. It belongs physically below the earth, in the dead world, and so is a peculiarly appropriate *munus* for the queen of that world, the consort of *Dis/Πλούτων* who is lord of the riches under the earth.⁸ In fact, the bough is not so much given to Proserpina as returned to her. When the Sibyl carries it down to Hades, it is recognized by Charon as something *longo post tempore visum*. I suggest that this does not refer to any previous heroic journey with the bough,⁹ but rather to the fact that it *belongs* in Charon's

⁷ So Norden, *ibid.*, p. 172.

⁸ As a matter of fact, it seems to be more familiar to Vergil's Italy than to Greece. The realm of Hades/Pluto to Greek writers was generally a place of gloom and cheerlessness, and his wealth was rather the agricultural bounty which is sent up from underground than mineral riches, *θησαυρός*. One of the few exceptions is the *χρυσόρρυτον . . . Πλούτωνος πόταμον* in Aeschylus, *Prom.*, 805-6. It is in the Roman writers, perhaps following Etruscan traditions, that we find the second element emphasized; in Naevius' epitaph, for instance (66 Morel):

itaque postquam est Orci traditus thesauro,
and in the *Iphigenia in Aulis* of Ennius, without parallel in Euripides' Greek (fr. IX Ribbeck):

Acheronta obibo, ubi Mortis thesauri obiacent.

⁹ Norden, following Heyne, first thought of an Orphic *καράβασις*, then changed his mind (*Aeneis VI*,³ p. 170). The earlier explanation, though wrong, is considerably better than his final one, which supposes that Charon had to recognize the bough because the Sibyl had said *ramum hunc . . . adgnoscas*. This sort of extrapolation of a poet's characters into reality is hardly a serious comment. Why did the Sibyl have to say *adgnoscas*?

world underground. Its existence in the upper air is considered here to be temporary and unnatural.

The only suggestion of shining or brightness develops at the moment of the bough's discovery, and it is presented in a curious and baffling expression (204) :

discolor unde auri per ramos aura refuslit.

The brightness is *discolor*, not pure light, but rather another and strange color in the dark and green of the wood. *Aura* is even stranger. Vergil is playing of course on the sound of *aurum*, but this cannot be the whole explanation. Normally the word has no visual sense;¹⁰ it means a quality of the atmosphere, an emanation, an "air." The poet may have been thinking of *superasque evadere ad auras* in the Sibyl's speech above (128); if so, the *aura* of the bough would again connote the underworld, and would be truly *discolor* to the living green of the tree. In any case, if Vergil is trying to describe the brilliance of gold, this is a strangely hesitant and unsatisfactory way to do it. Of course he is not. The hidden thing is found, but in revealing itself it maintains a secret and enigmatic quality. It appears to the hero's eye; it is his to gather. But even at the moment of action and success Vergil is unwilling to give himself up to one perception alone. Everything implies its opposite; the bough is seen, but by some faculty which is not exactly visual. Aeneas plucks it, but not with the necessary ease (210-11) :

¹⁰ I do not find *aura* so used before Vergil, although the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* proposes two examples. Varro, *Men.*, 139, *simul ac languido corpori solis calidior visa est aura* of course refers to heat and the sense of touch. Similarly Lucretius, IV, 251-3:

et quanto plus aeris ante agitatur
et nostros oculos pertergit longior aura,
tum procul esse magis res quaeque remota videtur,

is talking about the mechanics of seeing rather than sight itself. For him, it breaks down into tactile sensations, for which *aura* is appropriate. In fact, it exactly equals *aera* in v. 247 above. The *Thesaurus* also appeals to Callimachus, *Hymn. Dian.*, 117, φάεος δένενηνας ἀύτην. But ἀύτην from Homer down means particularly a breath of fire and means exactly that here. Φάεος is substituted for πυρός, and has no primary visual meaning. After Vergil, Lactantius, *Phoen.*, 44, is apparently the first to use *aura* in exactly this sense: *emicuit liminis aura levis*.

avidusque refringit
cunctantem.

Another antithesis is already beginning to take form.

The significance of the bough as death, or rather as the tension between life and death in a single unit of being, does not exhaust the image. It certainly does not preclude the traditional interpretations, but at this point requires them, and determines their application to the poem. The studies of Norden and Frazer have explored the wide importance of vegetation as related in primitive thought to life and death, and the survival in ritual or quasi-ritual procedures of these modes of thinking.¹¹ In relation to the grave and the underworld, vegetation universally appears to have the significance and the power of life. It is impossible to transfer this significance summarily to Vergil's bough, which is not vegetation, and whose symbolism is far too complex to represent life alone. But the investigators, although they have misinterpreted the image as a whole, have uncovered one point at least of supreme importance to the pattern which I have attempted to trace.

Vergil compares the bough to the mistletoe (205-8) :

quale solet silvis brumali frigore viscum
fronde virere nova, quod non sua seminat arbos,
et croceo fetu teretis circumdare truncos,
talis erat species . . .

We have already seen how the contrasts of color, texture, and growth between mistletoe and oak reinforce those between bough and tree. But the mistletoe, as Norden and Frazer point out, also possesses, in popular and mythical thought, extraordinary qualities of magic and sometimes of divinity. The simile then forms an overt point of contact, at which power is released from that deep reservoir of primitive belief and practice lying behind Vergil's image. Norden remarks of the mistletoe that it seems to have a double aspect, as a power of fertility, protection, and life, and as a power of death. It can heal disease and avert demons, but can also kill the tree on which it grows. Loki opens the doors of hell with a sprig of mistletoe, and kills

¹¹ Norden, *Aeneis VI*,³ pp. 164-8; compare Frazer's discussion of the mistletoe and the "external soul"; *Balder the Beautiful*,² II, pp. 76-278.

Baldur with the same. "Death and life in mythical thought are not always opposites, but can form a single unity." ¹² This is crucial. When an object has enough magical power to represent life, in a sense to *be* life, this power can be expressed and used negatively as well, to cause death, to *be* death. The power of life and death is a single reality. The golden bough, generically as vegetation-magic and specifically as assimilated to the mistletoe, has such a power. Like the lesser oppositions of color, texture, alienness, the primary paradox of life/death, immanent in the healing and parasitic plant, reinforces the created image of the poet. Again I do not mean that Vergil simply took over some primitive "idea" and proceeded to put it into verse. It seems rather doubtful that in such cases there is anything which can be called an idea, a formulation of phenomena, already existing in the folk mind. We may make abstractions like the one above which cover observed beliefs or customs, and the poet may draw his paradox from the same source, but both are products of a "sophisticated state of language and feeling." ¹³ It was Vergil who perceived or felt an ambiguity underlying the whole mass of observance, belief, and legend concerned with the relation of the vegetative power to life and death, and expressed it through his own imagery. The mistletoe-simile is the dark and environmental aspect of his meaning, connecting it with the secracies of the primitive mind. But the union of life and death implied by the simile could not have the same power—could not, in fact, convey its meaning at all—if the same meaning had not already been presented by the primary and immediate image of the gold, hidden and lifeless in the living tree. One mode of thought enlarges the other, and works the whole into a complex and sinister unity.

Interlocked with the task of the bough and obviously parallel to it is the mission to find and bury Misenus (149-83; 212-35). The two signs complete and guarantee the two requests of the

¹² Norden, *Aeneis VI*,³ p. 166. He discards this paradoxical unity in his interpretation, however, for the *progress* of nature from death to life, which is a different matter.

¹³ W. Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (2nd ed., New Directions, 1947), p. 195. His discussion of the union of opposites in a single word is extremely valuable.

hero. As the first answers Aeneas' personal will, so the other follows upon his prayer for his people's settlement. Misenus is not for Vergil merely an awkward doublet of Palinurus. Each does correspond partially to Elpenor in the *Odyssey*, the fore-runner who goes down to the shades in advance of the hero. But beyond this each episode has something to express peculiar to itself and organic to the poem. The resolution in Misenus' case is relatively simple. He has been the trumpeter of Hector and Aeneas, giving the signal for the battles of the past. Vergil used him thus deliberately, to make him the embodiment of the *Troiana fortuna*, the unfortunate destiny of the race, for whose end Aeneas has prayed. Like Troy, he is dead but not buried and in that state pollutes the whole company of *Aeneadae*. Once he is laid to his final rest, they are made *casti* at last, free from the curse of the dead city, and can participate vicariously with their leader in the journey of purification and rebirth to a new land.

Underneath its stoical surface the *Aeneid* is a web of anti-thetic symbols, of tensions and oppositions never finally resolved. The golden bough is one of the most critical and complex events in this internal structure. For Aeneas it is a symbol of power to match and complete his own. But the completion is produced on the level of magic, of the wonderful conjunction of external things. It is the Sibyl as folk-woman who demands it, makes it possible, and limits it to this sphere. The bough then is a testament of power, but not of resolution. As in the prayer for settlement, the poet has brought his other self, the hero, to a point of expression which demands revelation, and again the sign which is given does not answer the demand.

Aeneas in praying to see his father has come as close as may be to a divine sensibility, to an ultimate inclusiveness and reconciliation with experience. He realizes in himself at last the inner meaning of that Tree of Life to which he is compared in the Fourth Book (441-6):

ipsa haeret scopulis, et quantum vertice ad auras
aetherias, tantum radice in Tartara tendit.

The whole simile, of which this is the conclusion, compares Aeneas' stubbornness in the face of Dido's passion and Anna's

pleading to that of an oak wrenched but still undestroyed by the winds.¹⁴ In the context of the Fourth Book, the image seems rather too large for its setting. Aeneas is obeying the *fatum*, but there is not yet an adequate reason why in doing so he should encompass both hell and heaven. Vergil has suddenly passed beyond the immediate comparison and into a prophetic insight of something far deeper in the significance of Aeneas, which is not to be made plain until the descent to the underworld in the Sixth Book. The quest for the bough recalls images of tree, heaven, and hell in a pattern which completes the likeness. Aeneas is led to the bough by twin doves, creatures of the air and messengers of his divine mother. As they approach the goal (201-3) :

inde ubi venere ad fauces grave olentis Averni,
tollunt se celeres liquidumque per aera lapsae
sedibus optatis geminae super arbore sidunt.

There is a symbolic upward movement here, both in the connotation of the birds and in their action. But the flight of the birds is not only a reaching to heaven ; it is also an escape from hell. The tree is rooted in the jaws of Avernus, and the breath of the place is deadly (239-41) :

quam super haud ullae poterant impune volantes
tendere iter pennis: talis sese halitus atris
faucibus effundens supera ad convexa ferebat.

¹⁴ The image comes directly from the *Georgics*, II, 291. There it refers to the *aesculus*, and is part of a practical discussion of how trees should be planted. The passage continues :

ergo non hiemes illam, non flabra neque imbres
convellunt. . . .

One could reason from this that the isolation of the image in the Fourth Book simply derives from the fact that it is copied. Storm and immobility suggest the tree-image from the *Georgics*, and the tree-image brings along heaven and hell as superfluous baggage. In spite of this I should like to argue for relevance. The image which joins tree with stress has a peculiar internal importance in the *Aeneid*. The vision of Troy overthrown by the gods in the Second Book culminates in the simile of the tree cut down by human hands. In the Fourth Book the man of Troy stands against a human storm. Certainly the *quantum vertice ad auras aetherias* takes on a relevant meaning in this context, and the whole sense is completed by the association with Aeneas, bough, and tree in the Sixth Book.

The doves can lead him to the tree which is in this case his magical counterpart, but no further. The creatures of heaven cannot enter hell. Only the hero himself, like the tree which carries both bough and doves, can unite the two in thought and actuality, the realms of his mother and of his father, *amor* and death.

In doing so, he strains the nature of mortality. Such a mode of experience is possible only beyond the bounds of the normal human faculties. When a sign is given to guarantee this inner experience, one must expect it to have a similarly transcendent quality, passing beyond the contrasts of nature to an ultimate harmony. The bough does not possess this quality. Like Aeneas himself, in the Sibyl's skeptical view, it is unnatural, embodying the contrasts of nature, rather than supernatural, transcending them. The scene of its finding is pure magical prescription. No words are spoken; everything is action and movement in a ritual silence. The rite is effective and the hero receives his power, but not the knowledge of what that power should mean. At the summit of his experience Aeneas looks for a sign, and finds it to be but a mirror-image of himself, life-in-death confronting death-in-life.¹⁵ The *amor* which impels him to pass living into death receives no answer. This deeper antithesis of success in action/frustration in knowledge is the central and fundamental significance of the golden bough. Certainly it is this which effects that curious distortion of the language at the moment of the bough's discovery. *Discolor aura*: not the light of revelation, but the dubious and shifting colors of the magic forest.¹⁶

The golden bough is a moment in a larger progress. The relation which it expresses between the hero and the world is one which is repeated at various levels and in various forms throughout the poem. Aeneas is continually arriving at a kind of order,

¹⁵ The mirror-image of the bough even has a quality of distortion and mockery; the dead parent/living child relationship, the substance of Aeneas' fulfilment, is reflected and inverted in it too, but like the mistletoe the bough is something *quod non sua seminat arbos*.

¹⁶ See M. Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* (London, 1934), pp. 129-36. I am deeply indebted to Miss Bodkin's discussion of the bough. She is concerned, however, with seeking a universal archetype of the imagination which will include not only the bough but Dante's angel at the gates of Dis, and so tends to ignore some aspects of Vergil's own context.

a limited state of grace, and as continually finding that this is not the whole condition of his destiny. Always he must go on to more knowledge and suffering. The actual excludes consummation.

His world in Troy is that of the epic hero, and he is ready to fulfill the last demands of this heroism. In the last night of the city, the gods have departed from their worshippers: *λίπεν δέ εἰ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων*. The hopeless struggle, however, must still remain as the hero's necessity (II, 351-3) :

excessere omnes, aris adytisque relictis
di quibus imperium hoc steterat; succurritis urbi
incensae: moriamur et in media arma ruamus.

He expects his heroism to be futile; he does not expect it to be falsely construed. For he will see that the gods have not departed. They are still there, laboring at the destruction of their city. His vision of them at once denies him epic heroism and sends him forth in search of another means through which order may be found.

In Rome he attempts the opposite, the pastoral construction of the world, taking on the humility and communion of the Arcadian kingdom (VIII, 364-5) :

aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum
finge deo.

But his assumption of the mantle of Hercules plunges this same kingdom into war, kills its heir, and destroys the *aurea aetas* to which he has just been admitted. Even before the event he realizes that this effort at order is not the end (VIII, 520-2) :

vix ea fatus erat, defixique ora tenebant
Aeneas Anchisiades et fidus Achates
multaque dura suo tristi cum corde putabant.

The end of the poem brings no finality of knowledge. The Fury, for all her terror, is the angel of Jupiter, bringing the decision and the peace Aeneas has looked for so long. But he is blind to her, and sees only, in his private rage, the belt of Pallas. Dido's curse is already coming true, in a sense deeper than its original intention (IV, 618-19) :

nec, cum se sub leges pacis iniquae
tradiderit, regno aut optata luce fruatur.

Aeneas never fully possesses either the light or the kingdom that is ordained for him. Clearly the kingdom—Rome or Lavinium—is a historical fact, and Aeneas' failure to realize it is evolved circumstantially from the myth. It is far stranger, and more moving, that he never fully possesses that divine order of which he is the literal and symbolic carrier. Vergil seeks justification for Aeneas, not only by time, as Ancestor of the City, but in experience, as the individual who is driven by forces and looks for a personal fulfilment outside and beyond himself. The justification is never found. This failure is what we have already taken to be the central thread of the *Aeneid*, and the episodes quoted above, above all that of the bough, lie very close to it. The *Aeneid* is an attack on the part of the indeterminate, the various and fallible nature of man, upon the necessities both of history and of fate. The attack begins by assuming conquest; it ends by implying defeat and destruction. Man does not fit in history. Neither the hero nor the poet ever comes to terms with the ends which are so easily postulated and so desperately sought throughout the poem.

The *Aeneid* is a work in limbo. Vergil had left behind the satisfactory order informing his previous work—*fortunatus et ille*. He was in passage to the end of his own life-journey, never to be achieved;

felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.

The world of the *Aeneid* lies between the two, and hints at failure of the capacity to go further. The causes of things are never to be known with the same ecstatic certainty as Lucretius'. Neither causes nor things are the same, in Vergil's world. They are revealed, not deduced, and conceal themselves again in the act of revelation. In the Fourth Canto of the *Inferno* Dante has his master say of the sphere which he inhabits for eternity:

semo perduiti, e sol di tanto offesi
che senza speme vivemo in disio.

At the center of Vergil's poem, the golden bough, in all its density of suggestion, is the primary symbol of this splendid despair.

ROBERT A. BROOKS.

ARISTOTLE, *RHETORIC*, III, 16, 11 (1417b12-20).

Ἐν δὲ δημηγορίᾳ ἡκιστα διήγησίς ἔστιν, ὅτι περὶ τῶν μελλόντων οὐθεὶς διηγεῖται· ἀλλ’ ἔάν περ διήγησις ἡ, τῶν γενομένων ἔσται, ἵν’ ἀναμνησθέντες ἐκείνων βέλτιον βουλεύσωνται περὶ τῶν ὕστερον. ἡ διαβάλλοντες, ἡ ἐπαινοῦντες. ἀλλὰ τότε, οὐ τὸ τοῦ συμβούλου ποιεῖ ἔργον. ἀν δ’ ἡ ἀπιστον, ὑπισχνεῖσθαι τε καὶ αἰτίαν λέγειν εὐθύς, καὶ διατάττειν οἷς βούλονται· οἶον, ἡ Τοκάστη ἡ Καρκίνου ἐν τῷ Οἰδίποδι αἱὲ ὑπισχνεῖται πινθανομένου τοῦ ζητοῦντος τὸν νιόν, καὶ ὁ Ἀιμων ὁ Σοφοκλέους.

(Ed. Cope)¹

Vet. Trans. Si autem sit incredibile, spondere et tamen dicere mox, et vadiare quibus volunt; velut Iocasta Calkini in oidipode semper spondet, sciscitans quaerentis filium. et Annon Sophoclei.

(Ed. Spengel)

(διατάττειν vix invenisse videtur: an διαιτᾶσθαι vel διαιτηταῖς?

[Roemer])

The problem here discussed appears to be that of lending artistic verisimilitude to an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative. So at least it seems to have been constantly understood since the time of the Anonymous scholiast, who explains

¹ References:

Editions: L. Spengel (Leipzig, 1867); E. M. Cope (Cambridge, 1877); A. Roemer (Leipzig, 1885); J. H. Freese (London, 1926).

Translations: A. Riccoboni (Acad. Reg. Bor., Berlin, 1831); J. E. C. Welldon (London, 1886); R. C. Jebb, ed. J. E. Sandys (Cambridge, 1909); W. Rhys Roberts (Oxford, 1924); Lane Cooper (New York, 1932).

Commentaries: *Anonymi in artem rhetorican commentarii*, ed. H. Rabe (Acad. Reg. Bor., Berlin, 1896); *Petri Victorii in tres libros Aristotelis de arte dicendi commentarii* (Florence, 1548); *M. Antonii Maioragii in tres libros Aristotelis de arte rhetorica explanationes* (Venice, 1571); E. M. Cope, *Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric* (London, 1867).

Of these, Spengel's notes do not touch the problem; those of Victorius are little help. He paraphrases: "Si quod praedicas incredibile fuerit, polliceri debes, et causam te illico totius rei redditum esse, et te etiam stare velle iudicio eorum, quorum ipsis visum fuerit; ipsorumque arbitrio rem permissurum." See Cope, *Introduction*, p. 354, for criticism of this.

the reference in these terms: *ἐὰν δὲ γὰρ ἀπιστον τὸ δημογούμενον*. This assumption seems to underlie the English translations, however variously they interpret the subsequent advice.

Cope, Welldon, and Freese understand Aristotle to mean that the speaker, if his story be unconvincing, should promise to add an explanation immediately, and should set it forth to the satisfaction of the audience, or should submit it to the judgment of any whom the hearers approve. Welldon notes that the sentence "is hardly intelligible as it stands"; Cope struggles with it, but thinks "there is most likely some latent corruption." Roberts, following Jebb, prefers, "you must guarantee its truth and at once offer an explanation, and then furnish it with such particulars as will be expected (*or possibly*, and then arrange your reasons systematically for those who demand them)." "He must make himself responsible for the fact," says Jebb, and "Iokasta . . . goes on giving her word," reminding us irresistibly of the lady that protested too much. Cooper follows much the same line.

Yet it is conceivable, considering the disjointed nature of the passage, that Aristotle may mean "if the proposed course of action does not carry conviction." The *ἀπιστον* (for which "incredible," a favorite word with the translators, is less satisfactory than Roberts' "hard to believe") may lie in the advice offered. That would fit well with the context of *δημογορία* and reference to the future would make excellent sense of *ἰπισχεῖσθαι*. It may be noted that Riccoboni's translation, *si vero fide careat, polliceri oportet*, etc., preserves the uncertainty of reference. We might then take Aristotle to mean that if the advice offered is not persuasive, the speaker should say, "Take my word for it, this will happen, because . . ." and proceed to marshal his examples as required. The technique could easily be exemplified from the *Philippics* of Demosthenes and Cicero. It is less easy, however, to make this interpretation conform to the examples Aristotle uses. Little though we can know of Carcinus' Jocasta, it seems clear that the unconvincing element in her speech lay not in advice, but in the narration of the past. In the reference to Haemon, on the other hand, if it is actually relevant, the unconvincing element may be found as much in the advice Haemon offers his father, as in the interpretation of his own conduct.

If, however, as is generally supposed, the problem lies in the

Neither the reference to Carcinus' Jocasta nor to Sophocles' Haemon is much help. Some light may be thrown on the meaning by an actual example of successful presentation of an unconvincing narrative. Maioragius aptly instances Cicero's practice in the *Pro Cluentio*. The example is not strictly *ἐν δημηγορίᾳ*, but neither is Aristotle's example from Carcinus' *Oedipus*. We may note particularly 3, 7-8, where Cicero says, in substance, "The other side of the story has been accepted for eight years . . . but I intend to prove . . . if I may offer a detailed account . . . much might be said in preparation . . . I shall get down to business at once . . . but first I must briefly review. . . ." So he begins his story, not with an immediate explanation, but with *A. Cluentius Avitus fuit, pater huiusce, iudices, . . .* The same device is repeated at intervals throughout the narrative, for example in 6, 17-18; 10, 30; 14, 42.

Here the technique is not to give an explanation *immediately* of the unconvincing parts or aspects of a narrative, but rather to build up to them, and found them on, or shelter them in, a multitude of indubitable and admitted details. That is to say, *διάραξις* is here of the utmost importance. Precisely this technique is indicated if in the passage under question we read:

ἀν δ' ἦ ἄπιστον, ὑπισχνεῖσθαι τε αἰεὶ τι ἀν λέγειν εὐθὺς, καὶ διατάττειν ὡς βούλονται where ἀν λέγειν represents λέγοιμ' ἀν, as in the beginning of Polymestor's exculpatory speech in Euripides' *Hecuba* (1132); *ὑπισχνεῖσθαι* has its normal use with the present infinitive, "profess to be doing something," and *διατάττειν* is parallel to *ὑπισχνεῖσθαι*. The sense will then be: "If the story is unconvincing, speakers should always profess their readiness to deal with the difficulty immediately, and should arrange the presentation to suit themselves."

Consideration of the situation envisaged supports Jebb's *ὡς* as against either interpretation of the manuscripts' *οἰς*, but the sense requires that *βούλονται* be referred to the speakers, rather than to the listeners, as it is in the *Anonymus*. The main outline of the story will as a rule be known to the listeners, cf. 1415 b 34, *περὶ οὐ λίσσοι*, but in a version unsuited to the speaker's purposes. Whatever meaning may be assigned to *ὑπισχνεῖσθαι*, it is clear that Carcinus' Jocasta is trying to tell the story in her own way, and to elude the questioner's attempts to have it told "with what details" or "in what order" he wishes. Aristotle cannot mean that an artful speaker will allow his order of presentation to be dictated to him by an audience that does not accept his version of events, rather than by his own intentions and the principles of art. The syntax is loose, but no looser than the interjection of *ἢ διαβάλλοντες ἢ ἐπαινοῦντες* above, whose echo may suffice to justify the ascription of *βούλονται* to the speakers.

Furthermore, this reading fits in with the *αἰεὶ ὑπισχνεῖται* of Carcinus' Jocasta. It may be suggested that the reading *αἰεὶ τι* ἀν was corrupted into *καὶ αἰτίαν* by the natural affinity of *τι* and *καὶ*, and by the memory of the *αἰτίαν* with *ἐπιλέγειν* after ἀν δ' ἄπιστον *ἦ* only a few lines above, which memory may likewise account for the puzzling reference to Haemon. Aristotle certainly knew what Haemon said, as the reference in 1418 b 32 shows, and it was hardly a *διήγησις* in any sense applicable to the *Rhetoric*.²

² Lane Cooper, in a carefully reasoned article that has the special merit of keeping steadily in mind both the deliberate and the narrative aspects of the problem, *A. J. P.*, L (1929), pp. 170-80, discusses (a) the reading *διατάττειν οἰς βούλονται*, (b) the reference to Haemon, (c) the reference to Carcinus' *Oedipus*.

(a) He investigates the advantages of reading *οἰα* (W. F. McDonald)

In the Jocasta example, our ignorance of Carcinus' treatment compels us to depend on conjecture. If the text is sound, perhaps we should take it to mean, "when she was questioned by the man who was looking for *his* son." Polybus, for example, in that version, might not be dead, but might have found out the reason for Oedipus' flight from Corinth, and be anxious to find and reassure him. If the reference is to *her* son, the text would be improved by a suggestion of A. W. Gomme, that *τοῦ* may be an error for *αὐτοῦ*. As it stands, the reference is uncharacteristically vague. Aristotle may quote loosely, but where he mentions a conversation between two people he customarily identifies them (cf. 15, 2; 15, 8; 17, 16; 18, 1; 18, 2; 18, 6). If he wrote here *πνηθανομένου αὐτοῦ ζητοῦντος τὸν νιόν*, "when he was questioning her in the course of his search for her son," the situation might be not totally unlike that of Sophocles' play.

for *οἰς*; and if *ὑπισχυεῖσθαι* is to be taken as "guarantee," the emendation is a manifest improvement. *βούλονται* he takes as referring, "by general consent" to "the persons whom the speaker (more strictly the giver of advice) addresses." Unfortunately he does not explore the other possibility of which he is clearly aware.

(b) He investigates Haemon's speeches in the *Antigone*, in search of a passage that might be relevant here, and finds it particularly in 690-700. The thing that will strike Creon as incredible, he thinks, is that the people should question Creon's decision. "Haemon rightly thinks that his father is unprepared for the story. So he vouches for it, and promptly gives the reason why it is credible, so promptly indeed that the reason and the incredible thing are given together." This is very acute, and much more satisfactory than any of the other identifications attempted; yet it is so far from obvious, that one might fairly have expected such a reference to be illustrated by a quotation, as is the earlier and less abstruse reference to *Antigone*, 1417 a 28 ff. The identification is closely bound up with the translation of *ὑπισχυεῖσθαι* as "vouch for."

(c) In Carcinus' *Oedipus*, he envisages a situation like that in the *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles, in which the hero is not "seeking" or "looking for" Jocasta's son, but "trying to find out about" him, "investigating the question what became of her son."

These explanations, however, ingenious as they are, share with those of Jebb, Roberts, and Freese the disadvantage of straining the sense of *ὑπισχυεῖσθαι* and weakening that of *διατάττειν*; in addition, with *ζητοῦντος* in the sense proposed, one would have expected a preposition. The strongest point is the proposed identification of the Haemon reference; this, however, is both more subtle than one would have expected, and is valid only for the questionable translation of *ὑπισχυεῖσθαι* as "vouch for."

Oedipus, we may conjecture, became curious about the fate of Jocasta's son, regarded, perhaps, as a possible rival for the throne of Thebes; she repeatedly professed her readiness to tell him, but kept saying, "first I must tell you about. . . ." Those who knew the play would have no more difficulty in connecting the *αὐτὸν* with the Oedipus mentioned immediately before in the play's title, and in identifying *τὸν γιόν* as Jocasta's son, than we should have in understanding who was meant by "the child" in a reference to Sophocles' *Oedipus*.

L. A. MACKAY.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY.

A NON-LATIN ITALIC AND CORNISH PARALLEL?

That the 3d plur. pres. act. of the verb in I-E is formed from the bare stem-form of the pres. act. part. without any pluralising force seems quite possible, if not, indeed, highly probable (cf. Brugmann, *Vgl. Gram. der idg. Spr.*,² II, i, p. 455, iii, pp. 592, 594; Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.*, I, p. 658; Leumann-Hofmann, *Lat. Gram.*,⁵ p. 303), especially if, as may well have been the case, one here has a survival of a very primitive stage before inflexion or in which the plur. had not yet evolved (cf. Gray, *Foundations of Language*, pp. 153-4, 179, 182); and at least quasi-analogues appear to occur outside the I-E family of languages (Gray, *Introd. to Sem. Comp. Linguistics*, pp. 91-2).

Pres. act. part. nom. sing.: I-E *bhére/onts-, *bhérnts-, Skt. bhárant-, bhárat- (cf. dadhamś carum), Hit. atanz (i. e. *atants) "eaten" (diathesis!), Gk. φέρων, φέροντ- (Cretan nom. sing. καταθετός, Argive ποιησάως = Attic καταθετίς, ποιήσας), Lat. ferēns, ferent-, Umb. zeřef (-f < -nss < -nts; Brugmann, I, p. 374) "sitting," Got. frijonds, frijond- "friend," Lit. vežq̄s, vežant- "carrying," Gallo-Lat. *Mogons, *Mogont-, *Nōdons, *Nōdens, *Nūdens, -ont-, -ent-, Gaul. Carant-us, etc., OIr. car(a)e < *qārans "friend" (plur. cara(i)t < *qārantes), Welsh car (plur. ceraint), Corn. car (Late Corn. plur. keranz), Bret. kar (plur. kerent) (Pedersen, *Vgl. Gramm. der kelt. Spr.*, II, p. 104).

3d plur. pres. ind. act.: I-E *bhére/onts-i, *bhérnts-i, Skt. bhárati, dádhati, Hit. janzi (i. e. *jantsi) "they make," Arm. beren, Dor. φέροντι, Arcad. ποιενσι, Att. διδόāσι (with -āσι < *-avr̄i

or *-avτοι, like φέρονται [i. e. -ōsi; cf. Schwyzer, I, p. 287], possibly even in the Mod. Gk. type of θέλοντες (ε) “θέλονται” with -οντες < *-ov̄ts [Gray, *Lang.* III, p. 83]), OLat. *tremonti*, *cosentiont*, Lat. *tremunt*, Osc. *stahínt* “stant,” Umb. *sent* “sunt,” Got. *baírand*, ORuss. *beratī*, Gaul. *dugiontio* “who serve,” Archaic OIr. *tuesmot* “who pour,” OIr. *berit* < *bhéronti (Thurneysen, *Gramm. of OIr.*, p. 361), OWelsh *nertheint* “armant,” Mid. Welsh *carant* “they love,” Mid. Breton *queront* < *-nt(s) (Leumann-Hofmann, p. 305; Pedersen, II, p. 344).

The 3d plur. impf. ind. act. also comes into consideration here. Formally it was distinguished from the pres. by the omission of the final -i of the pres. and by the occasional prefixing of an augment: I-E *(é)bhēre/onts, *(é)bhērnti, Skt. ábharan (ab-harams tatah), ákurvata (mid.), Arm. *berein*, Gk. ἔφερον, Lat. *ferēbant*, OIr. -berat, Mid. Welsh *cerynt*, Mid. Bret. *carent*, OCS. *moga* “they can.”

In Cornish and the minor Italic dialects, as well as in Osc.-Umb., outside the pres. ind., but nowhere in Lat., the secondary ending -ns < *-nts has been carried throughout: Corn. *kerons*, *kerans*, *care(n)s* (pres., perf., impv.), Paelig. *coisatens* “curaverunt,” Marruc. *amatens* “amaverunt,” Volsc. *sistatiens* “stererunt” (perfs.), Osc. *fufans* “erant” (impf.), *deicans* “dicant” (subj.), *prūfattens* “probaverunt” (perf.), Umb. *dirsa(n)s* “dent” (subj.).

The same phenomenon appears in Corn. nouns. Here belong *abrans* “supercilium”: Lat. *frōns*, *frontis* < *fronts; *dans* (Welsh, Bret. *dant*) “tooth”: Lat. *dēns*, *dentis* < *dents; *gwyns* (Welsh *gwynt*, Bret. *gwent*) “wind”: Got. *winds*; *oliphans* “elephant” < Lat. *elephās*, *elephantis* < *elephants; *ugans* “twenty” < *uī-km̄ts-: Bret. *ugent* < *uī-km̄t- (Pedersen, II, p. 129). Analogical are *argans* “silver” (Gaul. *Argentoratum* “Strasbourg,” Mid. Bret. *argant*): Lat. *argentum*; *cans* “hundred” (Welsh, Bret. *cant*): Lat. *centum*; *cans* “with” (OWelsh *cant*): Gk. *κατά* < *km̄t-; *kyns* “first”: Gaul. *Cintugnātus* “first-born” (Pedersen, I, pp. 137, 500).

We seem to have, then, a close parallel, whether inherited or merely coincidental, between Cornish and Italic, outside Lat. and the Osc.-Umb. pres. ind.

LOUIS H. GRAY.

NEW YORK CITY.

REVIEWS.

FELIX JACOBY. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker. Dritter Teil. Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie), B: Autoren ueber einzelne Staedte (Laender), Nr. 297-607.* Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1950. Pp. 8* + 779.

FELIX JACOBY. *Atthis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1949. Pp. vii + 431. 35s.

I

More than a century has passed since Carl Müller completed the *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (4 vols., Paris, 1841-51; he edited also Ctesias in Dindorf's Didot edition of Herodotus [Paris, 1844], and the *Scriptorum de rebus Alexandri Magni fragmenta* in his own edition of Arrian [Paris, 1846]), a work which for its time was an outstanding achievement. But when half a century later Felix Jacoby conceived the plan of a new collection, there could be no doubt about the timeliness of this initiative. For the older work was neither complete in authors or fragments, nor were the texts presented in accordance with the standards, textcritical and otherwise, which classical scholarship had meanwhile attained. In addition, the fragments of the Greek historians, by the very nature of their preservation, are badly in need of interpretation, far beyond the meagre notes which accompanied Müller's texts and which, by the beginning of this century, historical and philological research had hopelessly put out of date. In his monographs *Apollodors Chronik (Philologische Untersuchungen, XVI [1902])* and *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin, 1904) and in the masterly presentation of his program "Ueber die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente," *Klio* IX (1909), pp. 80-123, Jacoby demonstrated that no one could be found more eminently equipped to undertake this enormous task which seemed to transcend the strength of one individual.

In spite of the first World War which interrupted Jacoby for a number of years in the midst of his extensive preparations, the first part of *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, containing the Genealogists and Mythographers, appeared in 1923; it was followed 1926-1930 by part II in four volumes, containing the writers on Periods (Universal Histories, Hellenica, Special Histories, Memoirs, and Chronographies). The work was received with enthusiasm from all quarters. Methodological precision and a fine feeling for literary qualities and forms are here combined with profound historical knowledge and insight in a blending of rare perfection.

The grave political disturbances of the thirties which culminated in the second World War also severely curbed Jacoby's activities, until an invitation by Christ Church enabled him to continue in

Oxford his work on the third and most voluminous part of the collection which deals with Local Historiography. The text of the third part is divided into three sections, namely III A: Authors on various cities and countries, that is authors who could not be listed under any specific place, like Alexander Polyhistor who wrote about more than a dozen different countries. It contains only 35 authors (nos. 262-296), but among them such important figures as Charon of Lampsacus, Hecataeus of Abdera, the poet Rhianus of Bene, Alexander Polyhistor and King Juba of Mauretania. It was published by Brill in Leiden in 1940 (cf. my review *C. W.*, XXXVII [1934-4], pp. 215-16). A voluminous commentary (III a) appeared in 1943 to which even more than to the previous ones Bidez's words could be applied (*Revue belge de philologie*, V [1926], p. 1059): "Ce commentaire est d'une abondance où l'on trouve infinité plus que le titre de l'ouvrage ne promettait." Jacoby, in treating Rhianus, e. g., gives a detailed and most suggestive analysis of the historical introduction to the fourth book of Pausanias on Messenia and the Aristomenes problem.

Volume III B (Authors on individual Greek cities and states) appeared in 1950. The arrangement is geographical. Under 78 headings, in alphabetic order, the fragments of 311 authors are published here (nos. 297-607).

Volume III C (Ethnographers), which, I am happy to report, is all but completed, is organized on the same lines as III B. It contains the fragments of 249 authors (nos. 608-856), e. g., more than fifty historians on Egypt (among them Manetho), the writers on Assyria-Babylonia-Persia (including Berossos and Ctesias), India (with Megasthenes), Lydia (with Xanthus), Phoenicia (with Philo of Byblus), Rome, etc. In both volumes the anonymous tradition, never collected before, about cities and countries has been assembled with as much care as judiciousness; that is, in addition to all quotations of the type *oi τὰς Ἀτθίδας συγγράψατες*, a generous selection of passages obviously derived from the works of local historians. More than twenty numbers of III B are dedicated to this purpose. Thus one finds under each city or country everything that remains of the historical tradition pertaining to it, surely the most sensible and practical system of presenting the fragments of the local historians and ethnographers.¹ As III B and C together will contain 560 authors and groups of anonymous quotations, nearly half of all Greek historians known to us are involved. No better vindication of Jacoby's method of arrangement could be devised than these two volumes. In fact, it would be hard if not impossible to imagine how a commentary could effectively be written on the authors dealt with in III B and C if they were arranged otherwise, e. g., alphabetically, in the way in which 138 authors found in III B had been published by Müller—without a commentary—in *F. H. G.*, IV under the heading "Scriptores aetatis incertae." To end this discussion

¹ A comparison with *F. H. G.* will be instructive: Of the 54 authors published by Jacoby under Athens (nos. 323a-375), 8 are found in *F. H. G.*, I; 7 in *F. H. G.*, II; 4 in *F. H. G.*, III; 18 in *F. H. G.*, IV; 1 in *Script. Alex. Magni*; 16 are new.

about arrangement, it should be pointed out that Jacoby has added to this volume an index of all authors so far published in *F. Gr. Hist.*

The wealth of the contents of III B is such as to defy even cursory description. Needless to say all the features which distinguished the earlier volumes recur in this most recent one, such as separation of fragments with book-titles from those which lack it (a comparison between Jacoby's treatment of Ion of Chius [no. 392] and the corresponding portions of A. v. Blumenthal's *Ion von Chios* [Stuttgart-Berlin, 1939] will show better than many words the soundness of this principle). Numerous are the additions to *F. H. G.*, of fragments as well as of authors. Apart from the most welcome innovation of anonymous quotations already mentioned ("Kollektivzitate"), there are over 75 authors not contained in *F. H. G.* Writers of historical epics like Lyceas of Argos (no. 312), Hegesinus (no. 331), Panyassis of Halicarnassus (no. 440), Xenophanes (no. 450), Eumelus and Diodorus of Corinth (no. 451-2), Semonides of Amorgus (no. 534), and Mimnermus (no. 578) have been justly included.

Numerous authors had been overlooked by Müller. Others have become known in the last century through inscriptions or papyri. The most spectacular discovery of an epigraphical nature (in this volume) is undoubtedly the Anagraph of Lindus (no. 532), a document in which, besides eight historians otherwise known, fourteen local historians are mentioned who occur nowhere else (nos. 509-10, 516-20, 522, 524-5, 528-31). Local patriotism plays an important rôle in most of the epigraphical sources: for instance, historians are honored by a community for having written historical works about them: cf. nos. 400, 466, 483, 540, 540a. This evidence, incidentally, serves to confirm the tradition about a decree by the Athenians in honor of Clidemus, the first Athenian writer of an *Attis* (323 T 2; cf. *Attis*, p. 75). Particularly interesting is the use of local historians in deciding international conflicts of which the most famous example remains *Inschriften von Priene* 37 (38); cf. *F. Gr. Hist.* 491 F 1 where, besides Theopompus, two historians of Ephesus, one of Miletus, and four of Samos, are quoted. One of them, Uliades of Samos (no. 538) is not otherwise known; for Creophylus of Ephesus we have two quotations from literature, one of which is newly added by Jacoby (417 F 3).

Very gratifying is also the new material which papyri have brought to this volume. Especially important are the fragments which illuminate Callimachus' indebtedness to local historiography, like the two new quotations from Hagias' and Dercylus' *Argolika* (305 F 4 and 8) or the story of Acontius and Cydippe taken by Callimachus according to his own words from Xenomedes of Ceus (442 F 1); cf., in addition, 323 F 13 (Clidemus) and 577 F 10. From the Didymus papyrus come not less than sixteen fragments of Androtion (324 F 30; 53), Demon (327 F 7), Philochorus (328 F 55 b; 56 b; 144-6; 149 a; 151; 155; 157; 159-162). Noteworthy, furthermore, the new fragment of Nieocrates' *On Boeotia* (376 F 1) which Campbell Bonner first had published in *T. A. P. A.*, LXXII (1941), pp. 26-35; *P. Berol.* 11 632 published by Jacoby in the ap-

pendix on Rhodes (533 F 2) (on the siege of Rhodes by Demetrius Poliorcetes in 304/3 B. C.); and *P. Oxy.* 1365 (on the origin of tyranny in Sicyon) which had previously been printed in II A as 105 F 2, with Jacoby voicing in the commentary the strong suspicion that the author was Ephorus, and which is repeated in the appendix to Sicyon (551 F 1 b).

The two Sicilian papyri *P. Oxy.* 665 (fragment of a table of contents of a book on Sicilian history) and *P. S. I.*, XII, 2 (1950), no. 1283 appear, cautiously, in the appendix to Sicily as 577 F 1 and 2. The latter, first published by G. Coppola, *Riv. di filol. cl.*, n. s. VIII (1930), pp. 449 ff., is printed with V. Bartoletti's greatly improved readings. Like Bartoletti and Jacoby, I am still inclined to consider Philistus as the most likely candidate for the authorship of this highly detailed account of Athenian operations in Southern Italy and Sicily during the winter of 427/6 (the doubts of R. Laqueur, *R.-E.*, XIX, 2 (1938), col. 2417, *s. v.* Philistos, are not convincing).

It may be mentioned here in passing that Bartoletti has the great merit of having recently published previously unknown fragments of two other historical works. One group of them comes from the *Hellenica* of Oxyrhynchus (*P. S. I.*, XIII, 1 [1949], no. 1304) and gives new information about events of the years 410-7 which by their striking agreement with the parallel account in Diodorus XIII now definitely prove that Ephorus, Diodorus' source, depended on the historian of Oxyrhynchus for the years succeeding the period covered by Thucydides. Moreover, Thucydides' name is mentioned in Fr. A col. II 31 (p. 72) under circumstances which make it clear that the *Hellenica* of Oxyrhynchus is a continuation of Thucydides' work. The reference is a new and powerful—though hardly necessary—argument against the identification of the *Hellenica* with Ephorus or Androtion (cf. F. Jacoby, "The Authorship of the *Hellenica* of Oxyrhynchus [with an appendix by P. Maas, containing the newly published fragments]," *C. Q.*, XLIV [1950], pp. 1-11, who mainly argues against Cratippus, and my discussion of the problem, previous to the discovery of the new fragments, *H. S. C. P.*, Suppl. I [1940], pp. 302-41).

The other papyrus (*P. S. I.*, XII, 2 [1950], no. 1284) contains an account of the battle fought in 321 B. C. near the Hellespont between Craterus and Eumenes. Preserved are col. 82 and the left part of col. 83 of the volume. It is a curious coincidence that this fragment also is closely related to Diodorus (XVIII, 31-2). Bartoletti tentatively suggested as author Hieronymus of Cardia, admittedly Diodorus' source in books XVIII-XX; Jacoby (*ibid.*, p. 15, n. 2 of the reprint) thought of the possibility of a work essentially based on Hieronymus, and III B, p. 743, proposed to insert it under no. 155. In a brief, but brilliantly convincing communication ("Ein neues Arrianfragment," *Gött. Nachr.*, Philol.-hist. Kl., 1950, 3, pp. 23-7) Kurt Latte demonstrated that the papyrus is a fragment of Arrian's History of the Diadochs (book VIII?), which, as was well known, depended, like Diodorus, on Hieronymus of Cardia (cf. *F. Gr. Hist.*, II D, p. 553, 40 ff.). The new fragment will have to be inserted after *F. Gr. Hist.* 156 F 10.

Volume III B has, as it were, two centers of gravity: Athens and Sicily. With 202 and 148 pages, respectively, they significantly occupy nearly half of the book. The Athenian material is divided into seven sections. At the beginning, naturally, stand the historians of Athens, the Attidographers, in chronological order. Readers will be grateful to Jacoby for his reprinting under no. 323a the fragments of Hellanicus' *Atthis*, already edited under no. 4. Very helpful is also the device of referring to the fragments not assigned to a book at the point where they would belong chronologically in the cases of Hellanicus (no. 323a), Androton (no. 324), and Philochorus (no. 328). Among the other sections, C, entitled "Teilgeschichten," we might perhaps say "Historical Monographs on Athenian Subjects," may be singled out, where one finds, e. g., Idomeneus of Lampsacus' treatise on the Demagogues of Athens, so well known from Plutarch's biographies (no. 338), a work which is wisely dealt with under "Athens" rather than in part IV under "Biography." In section E "State and Society" are included four authors on the *ἀξόνες* of Solon—among them the great Didymus (no. 340) who was altogether omitted by Müller—, Craterus' collection of decrees (no. 342), conveniently inserted here rather than in part IV, and the monographs on the *hetaerae* of Athens (nos. 347-50) which were not represented at all in the older collection. Section F "Religion and Cult" starts with the fragments of *exegetica* (in addition to Cleidemus, no. 323 F 14). The edition of the remnants of Lysimachides' work on Athenian months (no. 366) comprises in an appendix the passages in Harpoerat which are undoubtedly derived from this treatise. The last section, G, "Periegetisches," contains in particular the fragments of the writings of Diodorus (no. 372) and Heliodorus (no. 373), whereas Polemon is reserved to part IV.

The big chapter on Sicily is dominated by Philistus (no. 556), Plato's famous opponent at the court of Syracuse, and by Timaeus (no. 566). Both authors figure prominently in ancient critical literature, Philistus for his style in which he deliberately followed the model of Thucydides, Timaeus as an object of Polybius' not always fair polemic. All this material is clearly assembled in the Testimonia part for the two historians. The arrangement of the fragments of Timaeus in *F. H. G.*, I particularly lacked lucidity and J. Geffcken's reconstruction of a portion of his work (*Timaios' Geographie des Westens [Philologische Untersuchungen, XIII (1892)]*) is in this respect not helpful either. It will be a pleasure to work with this new edition of Timaeus, and this may be said in general, and most emphatically, of the whole volume.

II

Perhaps no earlier volume of this collection was so much in need of a commentary as volume III B, the more so as Jacoby's unprecedented and ingenious presentation of local historical writing in geographical arrangement opened up new possibilities of interpretation, which any other procedure would have blocked. This commentary fortunately is written. It consists of three parts. The commentary to nos. 297-322 and 335-607, by necessity voluminous, is ready for printing. The Attidographers (nos. 323a-334), owing to

their unique importance for our knowledge of Classical Athens, have been provided with an especially detailed commentary in two volumes, entitled *The Ancient Historians of Athens. A Commentary*.

The thoroughness with which Jacoby had investigated the problems of Greek, and particularly Athenian, local historiography, led him to set forth in a separate volume his conclusions about the origin and nature of the Greek local chronicle, with special application to Athens. Everywhere in *Atthis. The Local Chronicles of Athens* Jacoby's unique mastery of all phases and aspects of Greek Historiography is visible. Thus his book, apart from being an independent work, fulfills the double function of serving as an introduction both to the commentary on the Attidographers and to Greek Local Historiography in general.

In the first two of the three sections into which the book is divided, entitled "The Atthis" and "Attidography," respectively, Jacoby deals with the origin, the political character, form, and contents of the Chronicles of Athens; the third is devoted to the sources of the *Atthis*. He takes his starting point from the famous thesis of Wilamowitz of a pre-literary chronicle kept by the exegetes of Athens. According to this thesis, developed in analogy to the keeping of a chronicle of Rome by the *pontifices*, this pre-literary chronicle was published about 380 B. C. and formed the basis of all later chronicles of Athens. Proposed in 1893 in his book *Aristoteles und Athen* (I, pp. 280-8), Wilamowitz' theory had so far remained virtually unchallenged. It is his pupil Jacoby's merit to have definitively disproved it by means of a painstaking, truly admirable investigation of all problems connected with the exegetes of Athens.²

The second section of Jacoby's book begins with a chapter on the political character of the *Atthis*, a phenomenon which is substantiated by many facts and seems to me undisputable. Of course, the individual Attidographers reveal different political prejudices: Clidemus seems to have been a democrat (p. 75), Androton a conservative (pp. 74; 123; 293, n. 22; cf. on Androton's handling of the *seisachtheia* J. H. Thiel in his excellent review of Jacoby's book, *Museum*, LV [1950], p. 70), Phanodemus a follower of Lyeurgus (p. 78). An especially significant treatment has been given to the form of the *Attides* (pp. 86-99). Also in this respect the *Atthis* of Hellanicus, the importance of which is emphasized throughout the whole volume, was epoch-making. It was he who created the annalistic arrangement of the city chronicle which "remained authoritative for all *Attides* of the fourth and third centuries" (p. 89). Here Jacoby has some remarks worth remembering about the naive realism which is incapable of seeing beyond a positive individual piece of evidence and frequently passes nowadays as "higher criticism" (p. 90). In the chapter on "The Contents of the *Attides*" Jacoby

² The traditional conception of the exegetes of Athens and their origin has been contested by James H. Oliver in his book *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law* (Baltimore, 1950), which appeared shortly after Jacoby's *Atthis*. Since limitations of space have prevented me from discussing this matter in this review, I shall publish my views in a separate article in a later issue of this Journal.

investigates such problems as the differences between local chronicles and other branches of historical literature, like *Politeiai* on the one hand, and Grand History on the other (the Attidographers were not antiquaries; cf. p. 125); or the relation between the mythical (pre-Solonian) and historical times in the various *Attides*.

The "scientific" factor in the *Attis*, as evidenced by the historization of the mythical—that is pre-Solonian—time, has been given well deserved prominence, by presenting (pp. 135-41) as a test case the narrative of Theseus' expedition to Crete in Hellanicus, Clidemus, Demon, and Philochorus, which, in spite of the agreement in the general methodical approach, reveals far reaching and characteristic differences for each individual writer. Their decided interest in antiquities does not exist for its own sake, but is accounted for, to a considerable extent, by the desire to explain "old institutions lasting into the time of the writers" (p. 141). The method of explanation is aetiology which "simply states that they (i. e. the individual institutions and customs) originated each from a single event which sometimes was 'historical' by accident" (p. 143).

The style of the Attidographers is plain, a characteristic of the whole branch of local historiography. This attitude accounts, as Jacoby rightly suggests (p. 147), for the early loss of these works.

The last section on the sources of the *Attis* is of paramount importance not only for the understanding of the Attic chronicle, but for the whole question of the sources of Athenian history in the sixth and fifth centuries, the central problem being: whence did Hellanicus, the first Attidographer, get his material, and what material could he get at the end of the fifth century (p. 151). Any résumé would only spoil the masterful presentation of Jacoby's test case, the tradition about the Pisistratids (pp. 152-68). He rightly insists that Herodotus "is the creator of this section of Attic history" (p. 331, n. 5) and investigates then with most interesting results the pertinent accounts of Herodotus, Aristotle, Thucydides, and Clidemus (*F. Gr. Hist.* 323 F 15). The latter three all depend on Herodotus, but supplement him with additional information taken from the *Attis*, in Aristotle's case perhaps Androton, in Thucydides'—Jacoby's demonstration seems to me most suggestive—Hellanicus. Jacoby is justly emphatic on the subject of oral tradition as the source for Herodotus' history of Athens (pp. 165-8; cf. *Klio*, IX [1909], p. 111).

His remarks about the archons' list as an element of the tradition are of course strongly influenced by the remains of the archons' list from the Agora (published by B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, VIII [1939], pp. 59 ff.), which was set up more than twenty years before the publication of the *Attis* of Hellanicus who undoubtedly made use of it.

In the following chapter ("The Alleged Pre-Literary Chronicles") the origin of the *Attides* is discussed in the larger context of local historiography in general, with special reference to the *Ωροι* of Ionia, where the literary local chronicle undoubtedly had its beginning, probably in Samos (p. 183). Here also Jacoby comes to the conclusion that lists of eponymous officials, not pre-literary chronicles, precede the published *Ωροι* which were not yet used by Herodotus.

dots. He depends for Ionia, too, on oral information (pp. 178-85). An analysis of the tradition about Cylon and the chronology of the Pisistratids stands to show that this tradition does not derive from a pre-literary chronicle or from a contemporary annotated archons' list (pp. 185-96).

In the course of refuting Wilamowitz' theory that Local Historiography is the earliest branch of Greek historiography, Jacoby has given us the most beautiful pages of his book (pp. 199-202), a pithy, most impressive account of the development of Greek historical writing, slightly revising, as the result of forty years' experience, his views of 1909 (cf. p. 382, n. 10). In this development, Local History does not stand at the beginning, but at the end; it is the latest of the four main branches of historiography.

From this basis Jacoby proceeds to a scrutiny of the alleged essentially documentary character of the chronicles of Athens and states that an *Atthis* was not, like, e.g., Craterus' Collection of Decrees, a collection of documents, although it must be admitted that the Attidographers, and especially Androtion, made increasing use of them for their accounts of the fifth and fourth centuries. Wilamowitz' thesis that not only the first historical part of Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*—as generally agreed—but also the second systematic part, the description of the existing constitution of Athens, depends on the *Atthis*, is rejected. On the contrary, this survey was based on the material which had been collected by Aristotle and his pupils in the archives in Athens and elsewhere for the descriptive portions of the *Politeiai* as well as for Theophrastus' systematic treatise, the *Nomoi* (pp. 210-1; cf. Bloch, *H. S. C. P.*, Suppl. I [1940], pp. 355-76).

Jacoby's *Atthis* has blazed a path through a wilderness; it has done away with prejudices and wrong theories, which have remained unchallenged for decades, with such thoroughness that there is justified hope that they will never rise again. But far from being satisfied with tearing down what was unsound, he has given us a well founded and at the same time brilliant account of a most important branch of Greek Historiography which hitherto had been nearly inaccessible.

III

It may perhaps be allowed to conclude with a brief report about the future plans regarding *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. Printing of the Supplement, *The Ancient Historians of Athens. A Commentary*, in two volumes, one volume text, one volume notes (cf. p. 293 *supra*), started in the fall of 1952. It is hoped that the printing of the commentary to the other authors in III B (III b, also in two volumes) may follow immediately the production of the Supplement. Vol. III C, the text of the Ethnographers, will be next.

As the commentary to the Ethnographers (III c) is not yet written, it has been decided, in the interest of the public, to go on with preparing the text of part IV (Aristotle and the Peripatos; Antiquarian Literature; Biography), presumably in one volume. In the meantime, Professor Friedrich Gisinger of the University of Freiburg i. Br. has been working on part V (The Fragments of the

Greek Geographers). It will contain such important authors as Eratosthenes, Agatharchides (for other writings of theirs cf. *F. Gr. Hist.* 241 and 86), Demetrius of Scepsis, Artemidorus of Ephesus. Gisinger, well known for his book *Die Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos von Knidos, Stoicheia*, VI (Leipzig-Berlin, 1921), has very successfully taken care of the geographers in *R.-E.* (cf., e. g., his articles "Skylax," "Skymnos," "Pomponius Mela").

The work will be brought to a preliminary conclusion with part VI which will consist of three sections: 1) the edition of the remnants of Greek theory on history and 2) of the fragments of authors who could not be assigned to any previous part, and 3) the indices which will be very detailed and take into special consideration the legitimate interests of occasional users who are not specialists in the field of Greek Historiography. Whether it will be necessary to restrict these indices to the text volumes of the work, or whether it may be possible to include, at least to a certain extent, the commentary volumes which will then be published (I-III b, including the Supplement) cannot be decided now.

The final task will then be to write the commentaries to vol. III C, to parts IV and V (the commentary to V is of course reserved to Professor Gisinger), and to the authors published in part VI.

Two World Wars and many other tribulations have not been able to prevent Felix Jacoby from achieving one of the greatest and most useful accomplishments of classical and historical scholarship in this century. Let us hope that his work will be completed in not too distant a future.

HERBERT BLOCH.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

FRANÇOIS LASSEUR. *Les Épodes d'Archiloque*. Paris, Société d'Édition, "Les Belles Lettres," 1950. Pp. 332.

Given the fragmentary preservation of Greek and Latin literature, students of the Classics always owe a great debt to scholars who enlarge our knowledge by reading, interpreting and criticising fragments and reconstructing lost literary works. Lasserre undertakes in his book to reconstruct the epodes of Archilochus and to gain a clear idea not only of the single poems but also of the character and the composition of the book of the epodes as a whole. He is equipped for this purpose with a complete mastery of all the fundamental tools of philological research such as textual criticism,¹ paleo-

¹ An extremely convincing result of sound and conservative textual criticism is the restitution of Fr. 34 Bergk to an epode consisting of dactylic tetrameter, ithyphallic and catalectic iambic trimeter by mere elimination of the usual conjectural supplement *<μοι>* and the consequent attribution of the fragment to a merely iambic poem (p. 142). Another example of sound conservatism in textual criticism is the retention of *κυκλῶσαι* in Fr. 92 b D instead of the conjectural *κύκλωσον*; the consequence is the attribution of this fragment to the prayer of the fox instead of an ironical speech of the eagle and, therefore, a completely new understanding of the fragment, based on an interpretation of the

graphical insight and intuition, metrical knowledge,² the art of minute interpretation,³ and an insight into the importance of text history.

Careful interpretation led Lasserre to the following preliminary assumptions: a) the book of epodes was the most famous work of Archilochus and was, in fact, almost the only work of the poet which was read and quoted directly throughout antiquity, at least until the 2nd century of this era. Quotations of elegies, trimeters, tetrameters, on the other hand, originate in lexicographical and grammatical works of the times of Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus, in Stoic anthologies, historians or collectors of curiosities of all kinds (pp. 14 ff.). The methodological consequence of this assumption for Lasserre's purpose is that many an iambic may be considered as a fragment of the epodes, and, therefore, be used for their reconstruction. b) The five epodic meters as described by metrical authors in a certain order follow one another in the same order in Archilochus' book (p. 19). The methodological consequence for Lasserre's purpose is that the main outline of the composition of Archilochus' book may be considered as known. c) Horace gave his book of epodes the same metrical order as Archilochus' book had. In the second part of his book Horace follows not only the meter of his models but also their purpose very closely. The methodological consequence of this assumption is that the principal source for reconstructing Archilochus' epodes—especially the second half of the book—are Horace's epodes (p. 22). d) The epodes which were not imitated by Horace contained a fable. We know these fables by the collections of Aesop's fables. The consequence: Aesop's fables might be used as sources for the reconstruction of Archilochus' epodes.

The results for Archilochus' book of epodes are remarkable and well worth careful consideration: a) Archilochus himself collected his epodes and put them together in a certain order to form a book; this very order has been preserved in all the subsequent editions. b) The order of this book was chronological. c) The biography of Archilochus is, therefore, well known in so far as it can be gathered from the epodes in their chronological order. d) The invention of the different meters of epodes is explained logically and simply by the chronological order of the poems (pp. 24 ff.).

It is clear that the reconstruction both of the single epodes and of the book as a whole must necessarily remain hypothetical in a very large degree since it is erected on a very small base: the fragments are scanty, most of them short and insignificant, and often consist of not more than one or two words.

passage of the philosopher Atticus who quotes this passage from Archilochus. Here Lasserre's interpretation is corroborated by the reading of Plut., *Garrul.* 10, and *Amat.* 3 (p. 41). The correction of *ἀμφιερηριζομέναις* into *ἀμφιεριζομέναις* in Cratinus, *Archilochoi*, Fr. 2, Demianczuk, and the logical restitution of this fragment to Archilochus (with Reitzenstein and against Wilamowitz; p. 166) are clear.

² E. g., his treatment of Fr. 138 Bergk, pp. 88 f.

³ A very good and learned piece of work is, e. g., the interpretation of the fable of the fox and the eagle as narrated by Archilochus, Fr. 89 (pp. 38 ff.).

As an example of Lasserre's method we choose what he calls the 3rd and 4th epode, which he reconstructs in his fourth chapter (pp. 77 f.). In this case the evidence is extremely poor. Lasserre puts together 19 fragments for both of these poems. Of these fragments only two exceed one verse in length by a few words (one of them from a papyrus supplemented very arbitrarily); four give just one verse; seven only a part of a verse; and six a single word. It seems hard to find a sense at all in these miserable scraps and even impossible to combine them into the whole of two different poems. Lasserre's method is based on a *petitio principii*. Bergk had already guessed that his fragment 131 (96 D)⁴ belonged to a passage where a fable had been narrated; and he assumed either the one which we know as Aesop No. 180 Halm (The Camel) or Aesop No. 183 Halm (The Elephant and the Camel) or, finally, the one we know as Babrius 95—Aesop 200 Chambry (The Lion, the Fox, and the Hart). Lasserre takes the third of these suggestions for granted and is convinced that Archilochus told in his "3rd epode" the fable of the Sick Lion, the Fox, and the Hart. Under this assumption—and it is nothing but an assumption—the versions of this fable in Babrius (95) and Aesop (200 Chambry) give him the frame for the reconstruction of the main part of Archilochus' epode. But even granted this assumption, his identification and grouping of the different fragments are unbelievably weak. In the fable the fox goes to bring the hart into the cave of the lion. Now there is an iambic trimeter of Archilochus (Fr. 46 D): *μετέρχομαι σε σύμβολον ποιεύμενος*. This trimeter must be quoted—as Lasserre asserts (p. 79)—from the words the fox spoke, in Archilochus' poem, to the hart in order to persuade him to visit the sick lion. No verbal similarity between the text of the fables and the fragment of Archilochus corroborates his assumption. *⟨aīμa⟩ μυδαλέον* (Fr. 183 Bergk) must be said of the wounded ear of the hart. *Πτώσσουσαν ὥστε πέρδικα* (Fr. 98) belongs—in Lasserre's opinion (p. 83)—to the passage where the fox wanted to persuade the hart to make a second visit.⁵ Fr. 96 D belonged to the speech of the fox describing the hart's cowardice. Fr. 97 D, *Πάρελθε, γενναῖος γὰρ εἰς* was said by the fox in order to persuade the hart.⁶ Fr. 99 must, then, belong to an oath the fox took. The very mutilated *P. Oxy.*, 211 e is restored by Lasserre only in order to yield a description of the hart's second visit to the cave of the lion. Archilochus—in Lasserre's opinion—in this poem not only told the fable but wanted this fable to be understood as an

⁴ Only his fragment 131, and not his fragment 183 as well, as Lasserre says (p. 78).

⁵ Lasserre does not make it clear whether he thinks the words were spoken by the fox objecting to the cowardliness of the hart, or to the hart's blaming the fox for his behaviour.

⁶ A very slight similarity exists here between the text of Babrius and the fragment of Archilochus:

Babr. 81: 'Αλλ' ἐλθέ, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἵσθι γενναῖα

Arch.: πάρελθε, γενναῖος γὰρ εἰς.

But it should be mentioned that even this slight similarity is further diminished by the different use of the adjective: *γενναῖος* in Arch., *γενναῖα* in Babr.

allusion to the behaviour of his former fiancée, Neobule. Therefore Fr. 138 Bergk, *ἴνας δὲ μεδέων| ἀπέθρισεν*, has to fit into this last part of the poem.

The situation is even worse with regard to the so-called 4th epode. Here Lasserre establishes the frame for his reconstruction by assuming that Lucilius in the first satire of his thirtieth book (970 ff. Marx) followed very closely the 4th epode of Archilochus. Unfortunately we possess only fragments of Lucilius' poems and, therefore, have first to reconstruct the first satire of the thirtieth book to use it as a means of reconstructing Archilochus. In the reconstruction of Lucilius, Lasserre follows Marx without any reservation (p. 89), ignoring later work done on Lucilius. A glance at the literature concerning Lucilius would have shown him that the fragments of the thirtieth book could be interpreted in a way very different from that of Marx. No one dealing with Lucilius should ignore such an important book as Mario Puelma-Piwonka's *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (Frankfurt, 1949), which was published in the very year preceding the publication of Lasserre's book. On pages 156 f. Puelma gives a very lucid analysis of the thirtieth book of Lucilius and a full account of the bibliographical material; perhaps, however, Lasserre's book was already in print when Puelma's work was published, so that it was too late to use it. Lucilius somewhere told the fable of the Sick Lion and the Fox (980 M); Lasserre is convinced that this same fable had been told in Archilochus' 4th epode. Therefore Fr. 137 Bergk, *φθειρσὶ μοχθίζοντα*, has to belong to the description of the sick lion, even if there is no hint of this feature in the Latin fragments. Fr. 100 D, with its very uncertain text, must be spoken by the lion, asking the fox to come near him. The single word *φλύος* (Arch., Fr. 197 Bergk) has to fit into this context only because in Babrius, 103, 13 ff. the lion asks the fox to entertain him by his chattering. In Lucilius the fable was told in order to describe the behaviour of an unfaithful wife. And because Lucilius had the verse (991) *enplocamo digitis, discerniculumque capillo*, the one word *διαβεβοστρυχωμένον* (Fr. 162 Bergk) must be taken from the same context in the Archilochean epode—even without any verbal similarity between the Latin and the Greek fragment. Lucilius described a woman, whose husband is absent, as she runs around here and there in town and thus comes nearer and nearer to unfaithfulness (992-994 M). There is no direct evidence at all that Archilochus had done the same. Only an epigram of Dioscurides (*Anth. Pal.*, VII, 351) makes a very vague allusion to Archilochus and Lycambes' daughters. Without bothering about the very general and vague character of this epigram—which only proves that Dioscurides remembered Archilochus' quarrel with Lycambes and his objections to his former fiancée (he even speaks of daughters in the plural)—Lasserre takes it as sufficient testimony that Archilochus objected in this very poem to Neobule's running around in the streets of Paros (p. 94). And as to the final object of her ways and visits: the adespoton 8 D must be taken into this context: she visited the old Xanthe—in Lasserre's opinion evidently a match-maker similar to the old one in Herodas' first mimiamb. But the climax of this argumentation has still to be reached. Lasserre finds another reader and imitator of just this poem of Archilochus: Catullus in his 58th poem (pp. 98 f.). Is not Catullus' *in quadrivis*

et angiportis (line 4) an exact repetition of *ἐν ἀγναις* in Dioscurides' epigram and, therefore, surely taken from Archilochus' 4th epode? And, furthermore, Archilochus had said somewhere *παντ' ἄνδρ' ἀποσκολύπτει* (Fr. 124 Bergk). Is not Catullus' *glubit* (58, 5) in exact correspondence to this *ἀποσκολύπτει*? Let us, therefore, assume as certain that Fr. 124 Bergk was a quotation from this very context of this very 4th epode! In reality we know that the verb *ἀποσκολύπτειν* was used not only by Archilochus but also by Sophocles (Fr. 423 P); it could have been used, furthermore, in every passage of similar meaning in every erotic text in the whole of Greek antiquity, and it is only due to the fragmentary preservation of Greek literature that we do not know of more than two passages where it was actually used. Consequently Catullus could have written his *glubit* either remembering the verb *ἀποσκολύπτειν* from hundreds of passages, or independently. There is no proof at all of "Catullus as another reader of Archilochus' 4th epode," as Lasserre puts it.

In the case of the so-called 3rd and 4th epode of Archilochus the situation in regard to the material at our disposal is so hopeless that an attempt at reconstruction was almost necessarily doomed to fail: the fragments are completely insignificant and we do not possess a later text which depends beyond doubt on the lost poems we want to reconstruct. But the evidence should be better for those poems which Horace followed closely as his models. We choose as an example Horace's 13th epode, the model of which was, as Lasserre believes, the 11th epode of Archilochus.

What induces Lasserre to assume that an epode of Archilochus was the model of the 13th epode of Horace? Archilochus, Fr. 100 D—if read without conjectural change as it is written in the *Gramm. Hamb.*, and interpreted rightly—proves not only that Archilochus used the same meter, but is also of a remarkable similarity in situation and expression to Horace's poem (pp. 204 ff.).⁷ Unfortunately no convincing confirmations for the hypothesis that Horace's model was this Archilochean poem exist. The fact that Archilochus somewhere mentioned wine of Naxos (Fr. 151 Bergk) and Horace, too, speaks of an extraordinary sort of wine (line 6) in the 13th epode (p. 208) is certainly no proof at all. Furthermore in the commonplace expression, Archilochus, Fr. 8 (quoted by Stobaeus without the name of the poet), which Lasserre takes as the model for Horace, lines 7 f. (pp. 208 f.), the dissimilarities seem to be greater than the similarities; neither that Fr. 8 belonged to this epode, nor that this epode was Horace's model is, therefore, proved. Between Horace, 8-10 and Archilochus, Fr. 106 (p. 210) there is not the slightest similarity in the expression of an idea so often used in lyric poetry. Other evidence produced by Lasserre is even weaker: that somewhere in Archilochus (Fr. 169 Bergk) an oracle of Apollo was mentioned does not prove by any means that the poem in question was the "11th epode" and that Horace borrowed the motive of a prophecy (9 ff.) from this passage (Lasserre, pp. 215 ff.).

Whereas for the "3rd and 4th epode" the almost complete lack

⁷ The interpretation of this fragment is one of the real merits of Lasserre's book.

of evidence seems to be responsible for the impossibility of reconstruction, in the case of the "13th epode" Lasserre has not made the full and right use of the material at hand. Better methods of proving that Text A was the source or the model of Text B, and, consequently, of reconstructing Text A—if lost—with the help of Text B have to be used. What Lasserre does is a somewhat old-fashioned game: he states similarities between Archilochus and Horace, and concludes that Archilochus has been the source of Horace. Now, even if the similarities were much closer and much more convincing than they really are, they would prove only that Archilochus *could* have been the source of Horace, not that he really *was* the source. Neglect of this fundamental logical fact discredits the whole method of establishing the relation of source and imitation between two texts merely on the ground of similarities in subject-matter or in expression. What ought to be done in the case of "Archilochus epode 11" is this: it is found that Archilochus used the same epodic meter as Horace in his 13th epode; therefore, the possibility must be reckoned with, under the circumstances perhaps even the probability, that an epode of Archilochus was the model of Horace's 13th epode. And from this point on the research should be concentrated on the text of Horace: if Horace adapted a poem of Archilochus for his own purposes, his text should still show signs of this adaptation. A poem completely adequate and suitable to express Archilochus' thought and emotion in a certain situation could not express equally well 600 years later Horace's thoughts and emotions in another—though, perhaps, somewhat similar—situation of life. Discrepancies, weak points must be discernible in the structure of the later poem. Careful analysis of Horace's 13th epode would have to detect these traces of the poem's source. Put together, these remnants would add up to the skeleton of a complete whole, to the skeleton of Horace's model. So the analysis of Horace's epode would have a double result: a) it would show clearly what Horace owed to his model and in how far he transformed this model, and b) it would show what was Horace's very own in his poem. With regard to Horace's source, only if the model, as reconstructed with the help of its traces in Horace, coincides with what we know from other evidence of the "11th epode" of Archilochus, is it proved that his "11th epode" was really the source of Horace's 13th. And only after this has been established might similarities in expression or thought be used as additional evidence. The method of research to be applied in this case is fundamentally the same as the method used in every analysis aimed at discovering and reconstructing sources of a text.⁸ I do not know, indeed I doubt, that an analysis

⁸ These methods of research were first applied and developed in analysing such concise and stable literary forms as Greek tragedies. It was Zielinski's merit to show that the tragedies we still possess are full of remnants—Zielinski calls them "loci rudimentales"—of their lost models (Th. Zielinski, *Tragodumenon Libri III* [Krakau, 1925], Chapter I). I have tried, in several of my publications, to make full use of Zielinski's findings in order to develop a reliable method both of analysing given texts and of determining and reconstructing their sources.

of Horace's epode 13 would have given enough evidence for reconstruction of its Archilochean source. But the fact that Lasserre did not even attempt it makes his results and assumptions unconvincing.⁹

We chose Lasserre's reconstruction of Archilochus' epodes 3, 4, and 11 only as examples of his method and the reliability of his results. His whole book and all its parts have the same merits and are subject to the same objections. We owe Lasserre thanks for a serious attempt at a reconstruction of Archilochus' epodes, for very careful interpretation of the single fragments, for many readjustments in the text and the understanding of these fragments. His reconstructions, however, of the single poems and of the whole book of epodes have failed, owing to the scarcity of the material and to the neglect of an analytical method of research as described above. The conclusions concerning Archilochus' biography drawn from these reconstructions are, therefore, completely unprovable.

FRANZ STOESSL.

UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA.

Hérodote, *Histoires*, Livre VII. Texte établi et traduit par Ph.-E. LEGRAND. Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1951. Pp. 240. (*Collection Budé*.)

In this edition of Book VII Legrand is much less conservative than Hude. Besides offering some new conjectures of his own he admits a number of old conjectures which have not generally found favour, and some readers will certainly think he is too ready to find fault with the existing text and too strict in his expectation of grammatical uniformity and orthodoxy from Herodotus. It is a pity that he has not always enough space to explain his innovations either in his critical apparatus or in his note "ad versionem gallicam."

He often agrees with earlier editors that a word or phrase has been lost and makes some additions to the list of suspected lacunae. In 25, 2 he accepts Stein's $\pi\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\nu$ $\langle\sigma\tau\omega\nu\rangle$, an easy but perhaps not really necessary addition; and if the word is to be inserted, it should be put in the previous sentence; palaeographically the easiest place would be as the last word in the sentence $\pi\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\langle\sigma\tau\omega\nu\rangle$. $\tau\omega\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \tilde{\omega}\nu\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\nu$. In 109, 2, not content with Stein's $\langle\Theta\alpha\sigma\rangle\iota\omega\nu$ he reads $\iota\omega\nu\ \langle\Theta\alpha\sigma\iota\omega\nu\rangle$, which is more difficult Greek and no easier from

⁹ It is clear that in analysing a poem like Horace, Ep. 13 the first step would have to be the establishment of as exact a chronology as possible. Lasserre contents himself with quoting and following Olivier, *Les Epodes d'Horace* (Lausanne-Paris, 1917), p. 140, on this question. But wherever the problem of the chronology of Horace's epodes arises, such a careful study as R. Latsch, *Die Chronologie der Satiren und Epoden des Horaz auf entwicklungsgeschichtlicher Grundlage* (Diss. Würzburg, 1936) should be consulted.

a palaeographical point of view. In 139, 5 he reads *τοῦτο* <έλόμενοι>, repeating the word from the previous line, rather than follow Cobet in deleting *τοῦτο*; but the anaphora does not seem in place. In 116 he is probably right in preferring Stein's lacuna after *ἀκούων* to Hude's attempt to emend the word (he does not mention his conjecture *ἀνυσθέν*). In 153, 1 he is rightly dissatisfied with *οἰκήτωρ* ὁ ἐν Γέλῃ. Reiske's deletion of ὁ is not an adequate cure and he thinks something may be lost, perhaps *γενόμενος*. So also in 154, 1 he finds Reiske's deletion of ὁς after *Παταίκου* an inadequate cure and thinks (with Stein) that some further description of Aenesidemus, son of Pataecus, has dropped out. The same view is expressed by Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford, 1948), p. 378, n. 3. In 197, 2, where Hude gives no hint of dissatisfaction with the text, he thinks with good reason that the sentence cannot stand as it is and suspects a lacuna after *πρυτανίου*. He follows Stein in marking a lacuna after *έόντων* in 212, 1 and after *συμμίσγοντες* ἔξω τῶν *στεινῶν* in 223, 3. Hude in his apparatus does not mention Stein's suggestion in either place, but proposes to read *συμμισγόντων* in 223.

Legrand is often tempted by an easy emendation in passages where the traditional text presents a slight but not insurmountable difficulty. In 233, 1 he adopts Reiske's *ἔδοσαν* <ἄν>, which Hude does not even mention. In 132 Herodotus says that the Thebans *did* give earth and water; so even if they *did not* in fact make their formal submission until later, Herodotus apparently thought they had done so. Furthermore the emended reading is dramatically most inappropriate. What are we to imagine these men shouting as they rushed forward to surrender? Could they have hoped to save their lives in the heat of battle by pleading what they would have done under different circumstances?

In 6, 3 Legrand accepts Krueger's future optative *ἀφανιόιατο* instead of *ἀφανίζοιατο*; and in 49, 2 he emends *κομίζεαι* to *κομίεαι*, an exceedingly awkward form; neither change is really necessary. In 33, in the traditional text, we read of a headland *'Αβύδῳ καταντίον* ἔθα . . . ἐπὶ Ξανθίππου τοῦ Ἀρίφρονος στρατηγοῦ Ἀθηναίων Ἀρταϊκτην ἄνδρα Πέρσην λαβόντες . . . πρὸς σανίδα διεπασσάλενσαν. Legrand accepts Krueger's *'Αβύδον*, because elsewhere in Herodotus the genitive is found with *καταντίον*, and Stein's *Αθηναῖοι*, which gives a definite subject for the verb instead of leaving the reader to infer it from *στρατηγοῦ* *Αθηναίων*. There is much to be said for leaving the text alone here, as Hude does. And his change of *φέρει τά* to *φέροντα* in 5, 3 is a thoroughly arbitrary emendation. On the other hand he is certainly right in reading *εἶπε ὅρα τάδε* in 17, 1, so as to explain the occurrence of *ὅρα* in ABC, and *κιτάρις* in 90 (an improvement on De Pauw's *κιτάριας*) for the *κιθώνας* of the codices.

In 180 he breaks away from the traditional text *διαδέξιον ποιεύμενοι* τὸν εἶλον τῶν Ἑλλήνων πρῶτον καὶ κάλλιστον, reading *εἶναι* instead of *καί*, "considérant comme de bon augure que le premier des Grecs qu'ils avaient pris fût très beau." The traditional text with all its difficulties is better than this; the accusative and infinitive construe-

tion is scarcely possible here, unless *τοῦτον* is inserted as subject of the infinitive. In 205, 2 he proposes to read *τῶν κατεστεῶτων Τριγκοσίων* instead of *τοὺς κατεστεῶτας Τριγκοσίους*, a drastic cure, but he is probably right to insist on the difficulty of the traditional text: "Si Léonidas avait pris pour l'accompagner le corps des Trois Cents en bloc, il n'aurait pas eu à chercher en dehors pour compléter sa troupe de 300 hommes." He is also quite right to suspect *τῆς Θρηίκης* in 185, 2, where he points out that a local name is called for, perhaps *Οίταινης*. The sentence at the end of 228, explaining who was responsible for the *epigrammata* at Thermopylae, was suspected by Krueger, and Legrand suggests that it should be recast as follows: 'Επιγράμμασι μέν νν καὶ στήλησι Ἀμφικτύονές εἰσι οἱ ἐπικοσμήσαντες, ἔξω ἡ τὸ τοῦ μάντιος ἐπίγραμμα Σιμωνίδης . . . ὁ ἐπιγράψας. He is also dissatisfied with the last sentence in 237. In the text he follows Krueger, *κακολογίης* [πέρι] *τῆς ἐς Δημάρητον*, but he proposes *κακηγορίης τῆς περὶ Δημαρήτου*. Unfortunately he does not explain how these changes in the text might have taken place.

As compared with these emendations we must notice his preference for the reading of the codices where other editors have been dissatisfied. In 41, 2 he keeps the reading *διέλειπτε τε*, where most editors accept Schweighäuser's *διελέλειπτο*; he argues that *ὁ ὄμιλος* can be the subject of this verb, but this is very difficult Greek. He also refuses to change the apparently misplaced *τε* in 44. In 124 he rejects Vossius' *Ἐχείδωρον*, which is generally accepted, on the ground that the evidence for this form is late, and prefers to keep *Χείδωρον* as a native name for the river, regarding the other form as a later Greek rationalization.

For chapters 166-73 there are two papyrus fragments, of which only the first had been published before Hude's third edition, *P. Oxy.*, 1375 and 2098 (now re-edited by Paap, *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava*, IV [1948]). Legrand follows the papyrus in restoring *ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ* in 167, 1 (omitted by DRSV and bracketed by Hude). He does not note that Hude, following Abicht, also bracketed *ἐθύετο καὶ* in the same section; these words are in the papyrus and Legrand restores them to the text without indicating that previous editors had suspected them. In 167, 2 he follows Stein in bracketing *ὡς Καρχηδόνιοι καὶ Συρηκόσιοι*, which was omitted in PDRSV. *P. Oxy.*, 1375 breaks off before reaching this point, but one may well believe that it included these words, as it supports the Florentine readings consistently. In 170, 2 he fails to note that *P. Oxy.*, 2098 supports the reading of the majority of the codices *Μεσσαπίους*, and that its editors plausibly restore [*τὰς δὲ*] in 170, 3 instead of the incorrect *ἃς δέ*; and he reports it as reading *καταλέλειπτο* in 170, 4, although in fact it supports the reading of D, *κατελέλειπτο*. He might also have made it clear that it probably gave the correct reading in 172, 3 (Paap restores *βοηθέειν* [*δὲ οὐ βουλόμενοι*]).

The French translation, though generally excellent, seems definitely at fault in two places. In 102, 1 Demaratus is made to say to Xerxes: "Puisque tu ordonnes de parler en toute sincérité, de dire ce qui ne saurait exposer personne à être par la suite convaincu par

toi de mensonge" (*ταῦτα λέγοντα τὰ μὴ ψευδόμενός τις ὑστερον ὑπὸ σέο ἀλώσεται*). Legrand explains "personne" in a note: "C'est à dire toute personne qui, n'ayant pas comme lui à se plaindre des Lacédémoniens, pourrait être soupçonnée, quand elle ferait leur éloge, de partialité." This tortuous reasoning is neither convincing nor necessary. Demaratus, in using the indefinite pronoun "someone" simply means himself: "Since you want the truth from me and you don't want to discover afterwards that a fellow has been lying." The logic of such an expression is that the speaker identifies himself with anyone else in a similar position, as a man might say to his wife: "You wouldn't want your husband (or: a husband of yours) to tell you a lie."

In 172, 1 editors have generally printed: Θεσσαλοὶ δὲ ὑπὸ ἀναγκαῖης τὸ πρῶτον ἐμῆδισαν, ὡς διέδεξαν, ὅτι οὖ σφι ἥρδαν τὰ οἱ Ἀλευάδαι ἐμηχανῶντο: "their initial act of medism was forced on them, as they made clear, because they did not approve of the intrigues of the Aleuadæ." A similar use of ὡς διέδεξαν can be found in VIII 3, 2; but Legrand drops the second comma and translates: "montrant bien que les machinations des Aleuades n'étaient pas pour leur plaisir." It is perhaps sufficient criticism to say that a clause with ὡς is by no means the same as a participle; and the actions of the Thessalians, as described in the following sentence, show not their opposition to the Aleuadæ, but their unwillingness to medize. The traditional translation, therefore, must be preferred (Legrand's interpretation will be found in Rawlinson, but not in Godley).

There are four essays in this volume: on the decision of Xerxes as told in 1-18; on his preparations and his march as far as Tempe (19-130); on the Greek story, as told in 131-178; and finally on the story of Thermopylae and Artemisium, which covers the narrative as far as VIII, 26. The three main questions which Legrand consistently sets himself in these essays are: "How and why has Herodotus selected and organized his material; what are his sources; and how accurate is his narrative?" He argues that Xerxes' conversations with Mardonius and Artabanus, apart from the dream and the rhetorical detail of the speeches, are founded on genuine Persian information about a conflict of views between these men. He shows how in the narrative of Xerxes' march incidents are chosen and presented in such a way as to emphasize the king's despotic arrogance; that the only digressions not directly related to this theme are the geographical details; and that they earn their place in the text because Herodotus is telling the story of a march. He argues convincingly that Herodotus took most of his information from oral sources, making no attempt to rationalize their accounts when they allowed prejudice or even pure fantasy to obscure historical details. In fact, Legrand provides in these essays a firm basis on which the thoughtful reader can build more detailed critical studies; it is one of the great merits of this edition that he has always performed this task admirably.

His brief explanatory notes provide useful and shrewd commentary, though one could sometimes wish that he were more generous in giving references and bibliography. For example, in commenting on Gelon's remark that "the spring has been taken out of

the year" (162, 1), he says that if this saying has been borrowed from a funeral oration of Pericles it is much less apt as used by Gelon; but he does not give the references to Aristotle (*Rhet.*, I, 7; III, 10) where we are told that Pericles used these words. Some of Legrand's original suggestions may be mentioned briefly here. He thinks that the visit of Xerxes to Tempe was probably not a pleasure excursion, but a military reconnaissance which made him decide against using this route; that Herodotus, in timing his visit after his decision to use the "upper route" through Thessaly, probably reversed the actual order of events. As for this upper route, which according to Herodotus was unknown to the Greeks when they first went up to Thessaly (173, 4), it is suggested that they thought it impassable for a large army and took fright only when they learned Xerxes was actually building a road along it (cf. 131). In discussing the statement of Herodotus (severely criticized by Plutarch) that the Thebans remained at Thermopylae against their will and that Leonidas retained them as hostages (222), he tries to discover what actually happened; Leonidas may have felt that their presence tied the hands of Thebes; but the Thebans, who were too numerous to be retained against their will, must have had a reason of their own for staying—perhaps in order that their country might still have the benefit of the doubt when the Greek world came to pass judgment on its conduct.

This volume is an important and stimulating contribution to Herodotean scholarship. The misprints, though more numerous than they should be, will not cause the reader serious inconvenience. For reference purposes the text would be easier to use if the numbers of sections were given within the chapters; but it is rather late to make this complaint now, when seven volumes out of nine have appeared.

LIONEL PEARSON.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

E. DEMOUGEOT. *De l'unité à la division de l'Empire Romain, 395-410. Essai sur le gouvernement impérial.* Paris, Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1951. Pp. xvi + 618; 1 plate. \$5.30.

This closely reasoned and well documented study aims at the solution of two problems: the cause of the rift between East and West that occurred within the period 395-410, and an evaluation of the personality and policy of Stilicho. The two problems, Demougeot argues, are in reality but one. What made the latent tension between the two halves of the Empire acute and permanent was the Germanic invasions 407-410, which culminated in Alaric's sack of Rome. These same invasions brought about the fall of Stilicho, whose unionist policy failed because neither he nor his political enemies were able to foresee them or to understand them as part of the vast migration of peoples then under way.

On the morrow of Theodosius' death, East Rome and West Rome were still generally felt to be the two halves of one and the same

Empire. Either half, to be sure, had its own problems, resulting from different religious, social, economic, and military conditions. Yet there was still one law; it only had to face different obstacles (p. 88). After 410, an East that is virtually intact turns away from a West that lies in ruins. Whereas in the West general poverty fosters feudalism, and the emperors yield their place to Germanic kings, Constantinople sees the rise of absolute monarchy; and eastern Caesarpapism is in sharp contrast to the ascent of the Church of Rome. When, in 438, the Theodosian Code was promulgated for the whole *orbis* the official copy sent to the Roman senate was duly acknowledged but remained a dead letter as it no longer applied to western conditions.

Against this general background the author invites us to see the fateful events of 395-410. When Theodosius divided the Empire between his two sons he did not mean to introduce a permanent partition. On the contrary, the unity of the Empire was emphasized in the person of Stilicho, who, whilst regent only for the *parts occidentis*, had been appointed executor of the late emperor's testament, and, as Demougeot plausibly argues, tutor of both princes during their minority; besides, he was commander-in-chief of all the imperial armies, both Eastern and Western (pp. 99-104). Although his political position in the East was purely moral, it would have been easy for him, with the army at his command, to unite the whole Empire under his regency, or even to make himself emperor. Yet, in spite of hostile allegations, there is no evidence to suggest that he ever aspired to the throne; he even resisted for a long time the temptation to extend his regency to the East by force of arms. This seems all the more surprising as his entire policy aimed at maintaining the union of the two *partes*. The key to this puzzle Demougeot finds in Stilicho's personality (pp. 139-42). This thoroughly romanized scion of "barbarian" nobility fell a victim to his belief in his adopted civilization. With the "old-timers" among the senatorial nobility of his day he shared the illusion that the late Empire was still the Rome of a distant past. They, however, were Romans by birth, he merely by education. This "man of goodwill but without either imagination or initiative" could not conceive of a Rome other than the traditional picture of her rhetors and historians. This Rome he was to preserve, not to impose himself on her. Moreover, he bore an unbounded loyalty to the house of Theodosius, to whom he owed all that he was. For this loyalty he paid with a daily decrease of his power, and ultimately with his life. It was loyalty to Arcadius that prevented him from armed intervention in 395, against Rufinus, and again in 400, against the tyranny of Gainas after the fall of Eutropius; when he let Alaric escape from Pholoe in 397 he probably did so in order to spare Arcadius, who, through his minister Eutropius, had opened secret negotiations with the Visigoth king (pp. 171 f.). Yet all the time Stilicho hoped for an opportunity of settling the affairs of the East as its lawful protector. His scrupulous loyalty, however, spoiled his chance. When he was eventually forced to act he not only had to face a strong anti-teutonic policy at the Byzantine court, headed by Anthemius, but also found his own sovereign, Honorius, turned

nationalist and "anti-barbarian," and ever less willing to listen to his "barbarian" mentor. By some tragic irony, an *entente*, if only temporary, of East and West was brought about just then, but in a spirit that put Stilicho out of action. His failure to cope with the double threat of the usurper Constantine III and the new tide of Germanic invasions sealed his fate.

Stilicho's dealings with the German invaders of Italy are overshadowed by the indifference, and even hostility, of the East on the one hand, and the general blindness (his own included) to the extent and true nature of the Germanic problem on the other. It was impossible to defend the Empire against a simultaneous attack on several fronts. Even local attacks on a large scale could be repulsed only by a concentration of forces. Now eastern "anti-barbarianism," growing as it did from 400 A. D., tended to keep aloof from the affairs of a "barbarized" West. In order to meet the invasions of Alaric in 402-3 and of Radagais in 405, Stilicho, left to his own resources, had to strip the Rhine frontier of most of its defenders, and thus exposed it to the disaster of New Year's night 407. It was this refusal of military collaboration on the part of the eastern government that made Stilicho realize that the break had become inevitable; proof of his changed attitude is his alliance with Alaric against Constantinople and his preparations for an eastern war. This alliance, however, made him suspect at the court of Ravenna, where during the recent invasions an anti-teutonic party had come to power. This party grew steadily in strength as Stilicho's influence was on the wane. Honorius was completely won over. Under the double threat of 407, the war with Constantinople had to be abandoned. Even so, there could be no question of fighting the Vandals and Constantine at the same time. Once more Silicho, an ever loyal servant of his master, decided to fight the usurper rather than the barbarians. This proved to be the ruin of the West as well as his own. According to Demougeot's persuasive analysis of the evidence (pp. 425-7), Stilicho went with open eyes into the trap that was laid for him because his sole alternative would have been to become a rebel, and thus to unleash civil war and invite another invasion of Italy by either Constantine or Alaric. If his end was meant as a deliberate sacrifice, however, it was in vain. Honorius recognized Constantine as his colleague, and stuck obstinately to his anti-German policy until the exasperated Alaric, reluctantly, decided to storm Rome.

To the superficial observer it might thus appear that Stilicho's failure as a politician (at least after 400) and his increasing difficulties in defending the West against external enemies worked towards the bitter end in a vicious circle. Such readers are warned by Demougeot (pp. 488 f.) that the interplay of these factors merely accelerated a course of events that seemed inevitable. The Roman Empire had long reached the limits of its capacity. Its frontiers could resist unruly neighbours, but not wave after wave of peoples in quest of new homes. The military victories of Stilicho at Pollentia, Verona, and Fiesole did not save Rome because they were neither exploited strategically nor could they have the result of stemming the tide of migrations (p. 276). The deep-rooted causes

of this failure are merely hinted at: the condition of the imperial army, and the imagined self-sufficiency of Greco-Roman civilization.

The Roman army, having been mercenary for centuries, with the Roman element ever decreasing, was then largely composed of Germans. This semi-barbarian army not only weighed heavily on the population but was also felt as a permanent threat. Yet this same army, then as always, was the sole power on which monarchy could rely. It was for dynastic reasons that Theodosius made his generalissimo the trustee of his house and realm.

Could the imperial army have stood the test of a large-scale foreign war? It was, to begin with, limited in numbers—a limit imposed not only by state finances, but also by economic and social factors, and by political considerations. So far, the Empire had never had to fight a power that threatened its very existence. Now it had to face such a threat, all the more dangerous because of its amorphous nature, and this at a moment when the discord of East and West made Rome particularly vulnerable. If Stilicho did not follow up his successes the reason can only have been that he was short of troops. However, even a flawless strategy would have made little difference in the end because it would always have been devised merely for stopping raids, not for diverting an avalanche. No Roman ever realized that all the invasions of Northerners, from the Cimbri to the Vandals, were phases of one great movement, which ought to be tackled as a whole. Had this been done, the Empire, with all its shortcomings, might have become the nucleus of an organized resistance to the ultimate cause of the upheaval, the migration of the Huns. Greco-Roman civilization, however, was typically Mediterranean, walled in, spiritually as well as physically, by the great mountain-ranges. Parthia, India, China did not impress themselves on the Roman mind as entities of their own; even less so would the barbarians of the North. Not even their need of land was taken quite seriously. The half-hearted methods of absorption either by the army (as *foederati*) or by the countryside (as *coloni*) proved insufficient and to some extent dangerous; besides, they caused an antiteutonic reaction. This reaction, logically, turned in the first place against the German element in the army; in the East this led to a regular purge. The alternative of a citizen army, however, offered by nationalist circles, was purely imaginary; the days of the militia were gone with the city state. What proved a failure in the East was impossible in the West; it worked havoc at the first try-out. It was the good luck of the East that, under renewed pressure of the Huns, the peoples of the Danube region and of Central Europe moved westward; thus Eastern politicians, pardonably, might believe that Alaric's raid of the Peloponnese or the revolt of Tribigild were isolated events. For the West the same error was disastrous. The loss of the western half was the price which the Empire had to pay for identifying itself with the world (p. 568).

The well-written text is copiously annotated. Demougeot has a wide command not only of the primary sources, historical, literary, religious, legal, but also of modern literature concerning her period. It is regrettable that in a work of this nature the sources are quoted

mostly in translation. *Cui bono?* At the end of the book there is a good selective bibliography, and indexes; one misses a chronological survey. Some misprints have been corrected on a loose sheet of *Errata*, but not all; uncorrected are, *inter alia*, the wrong date 398 (for 388) on p. 175, line 10, and "Alt-Open" (for "Alt-Ofen"), i. e. Aquineum, on p. 378.

No one will expect that in a book like this the treatment of every detail should be exhaustive. I offer some remarks made at random from my special fields of research. In the two notes on Aetheria (more correctly Egeria), p. 122, n. 16, and 125, n. 37, the review of H. Pétré's edition by Christine Mohrmann, *Vigiliae Christianae*, IV (1950), pp. 119-23, might have been mentioned, in particular Professor Mohrmann's endorsement, on linguistic grounds, of the early date of Egeria's pilgrimage—in opposition to the late dating of most linguists (including, quite recently, L. Spitzer, *Comparative Literature* [1949], p. 250). Note 189 on p. 387 should be recast in the light of T. F. O'Rahilly's *Early Irish History and Mythology* (Dublin, 1946). Nath Í, who died *ca.* 445 (not *ca.* 425), was never high king of Ireland, but merely king of Connacht (O'Rahilly, pp. 211-15). In note 233, p. 553, where Demougeot speaks of the dechristianization of Northern Britain, she might have mentioned St. Patrick's reference to the "apostate Piets" (*Epist.*, II, 15).

Such minor imperfections, however, do not detract from the value of this most promising first book.

LUDWIG BIELER.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

YALE CLASSICAL STUDIES, XII, edited for the Department of Classics
by ALFRED R. BELLINGER and HARRY M. HUBBELL. New Haven,
Yale Univ. Press, 1951. Pp. 265.

H. N. Porter's work on "The Early Greek Hexameter" (pp. 1-63) is extraordinarily clear, considering the appalling complexity of the subject. Perhaps, however, in such a study (not a "science," p. 8, *al.*) even clarity is a danger. It has been remarked of the pursuit of Economics that if it's difficult, it's bad enough; but if it's easy, it's impossible. Yet Porter appears to come off well and his supplementation of Fraenkel's *cola* demonstration (see especially p. 24, n. 49) is very important indeed. A few points may be noted: on p. 36 Porter condemns the principle of anomaly: "To castigate rare metrical usages, and sometimes to amend them away, using as a canon the poet's more common practices, is to blind ourselves to some of the most remarkable possibilities of the hexameter form." He then proceeds to a brilliant discussion of "three rare variations." But he has himself told us, and told us truly (p. 13), that such a line as

ἄνδρα πολύτροπον ἔννεπε, Μοῦσά, μοι, ὃς μάλα πολλά

is impossible. "In no case," he says, "in any poet does a word end in position 6 unless it is preceded by the B caesura." (You will

have to dig out his terminology, which is not difficult, for yourselves.) This holds good for both Greek and Latin hexameters (if we except Ennius); but the explanation may have seemed so obvious that it was passed over in silence. The reason for this state of affairs is that the third foot cannot be self-contained (*εὐεπε*): this is a fundamental fact which may go beyond a matter of simple *cola* and suggest that our pursuit of ancient metries is by no means at an end. Whether the third foot does or does not have a *caesura* is, perhaps, secondary in importance (see, e. g. Verg., *Aen.*, III, 549) to the fact that it cannot be self-contained. But if such a monstrosity crops up in the papyri or has escaped the editors of *Manetho*, say, is it going to be emended or expelled? There are degrees of anomaly and the worst of them is credulity—not, one must hasten to add, a visible defect of Porter's, who is now on the threshold of definitive work in the thorniest and most perplexing of subjects. To a layman like myself even this preliminary essay seems to be sound and impressive. Last, let me signalise his rectitude in controverting one of the worst judgments of E. G. O'Neill, Jr. (p. 49).

S. G. P. Small (pp. 67-145) publishes an exhaustive article on *Marcus Argentarius*, followed by a text and commentary (though one would feel happier if he had collated the Planudean material for himself, as he has the Palatine). Every reasonable means of identifying and dating the elusive poet is attacked and found wanting, though when Small says (p. 97) that "as far as internal evidence is concerned" the epigrams "might have been written at almost any time between the third century B. C. and the age of Justinian," he forgets the indications of *A. P.*, V, 105 and IX, 286 which he has clearly stated on p. 68. There is also a minute examination of metre, vocabulary, style, and characteristics. Unfortunately a number of details call for comment:

A. P., V, 16, 5: no attention is paid to Desrousseaux's correction which even Maas (*Gnomon*, VII, p. 577) approves; one might also suggest *ηδε* *ἐπιπέμψω*.

V, 63, 1: for the possibilities of the pun see not only *A. J. P.*, LXVII, p. 150, but also Herwerden, *Mnem.*,² II, p. 306; Pezopoulos, *Byz. neogr. Jahrb.*, VIII, p. 177.

V, 104, 3-4: surely these lines should be printed as a question.

V, 113, 2: Headlam, *C. R.*, VI, p. 270, refuted Mackail's correction. Vs. 1 means "you fell in love." Vs 6: to the parallels add Favorinus, *De exil.*, col. 16, 40.

V, 116, 2: Small does not feel Waltz' compunction about the adjective. Vs. 4: the sense is not so remarkable as Small (pp. 83, 117) seems to think: see the passages cited by Gow on *Theocr.*, 1, 85.

V, 118, 1: the acc. is not at all odd "bei den Verben des Atmens und Riechens" (Kuehner-Gerth, II, 1, p. 309). If that will cover the text, keep it; otherwise read *οσθεις*.

V, 127, 1: the technical sense of *πειρας* is explained by Headlam, *J. P.*, XXVI, p. 95. Vs. 5 I do not understand: Jacobs' corrections (see also *Jahresber.*, CCXXX, p. 149) would help; or Pezopoulos

(*loc. cit.*), though more elaborate, may be right. At any rate the latter adds a brilliant pun in Marcus' best (or worst) manner. Vs. 6: see also Menander, *Epitrep.*, 67, 100.

VI, 201, 2: *οὐλον* looks plausible enough, but that is all the more reason why Meineke's conjecture (*Philol.*, XIV, p. 33) should at least be mentioned.

VI, 246: not all of Philodemus' poems have a "highly individual style"; but in what Small aptly calls "the pleasant chaos of the Greek Anthology" it will as yet do no good to suggest Antiphilus as author. Vs. 6: Small does not explain the adjective. Stadt-mueller's conjecture, adopted by Paton, seems the very thing (cf. Nonn., *D.*, XLVIII, 307). Vs. 7: Small does not suggest why the particle is common in prayers (Denniston, p. 16).

VI, 333, 3-4: I am not the only one who has failed to understand these strange lines. The lamp is called *ἄναξ* because it may turn out to be like Apollo; it is hung on a tripod. At this point one must say firmly that all editors should be compelled to translate every comma that they print: it is the first and most important step to a commentary (cf. *A. J. P.*, XXIII, p. 345; Mazon, *Gnomon*, XXIII, p. 301). If "new conjectures, extorted by the task" (Housman, *Manil.*, V, p. xxiv) appear, so much the better. An attempt, at least, to understand consecutively will have been made.

VII, 364: cf. Wilamowitz, *Hellen. Dicht.*, I, p. 110.

VII, 374, 7: read *ναύτης* if *δρόπον* can stand alone with *ναυτικόν* understood from both parts of the line: "not even so, sailor that I was, did I abandon my course," but merely changed from one ship to another.

VII, 384, 5: It seems unnatural to take the "light pitcher" in any other way than as a Danaid receptacle. Read then, perhaps

εἰπε τάδ', εἰ Μίνων σφήλαι· φέρε κάλπιν ἐλαφρήν.

"She said, trying to deceive Minos, 'Give me a light pitcher'" (cf. Lumb, *Notes on the Gk. Anth.*, p. 41).

VII, 403, 6: Herwerden, *Mnem.*, XXVIII, p. 37.

IX, 161: there is a delightful translation by Walter Leaf in *C. R.*, XXXII, p. 47. Something is still to be said for Bothe's conjecture in vs. 3, which gives point to "my hands" in vs. 1.

IX, 221, 6: Herwerden, *Mnem.*, II², p. 332.

IX, 246, 5: correxit Bothius. Suppose the MS had happened to read the genitive in IX, 55¹, 5, would it have been retained?

X, 4, 5-6: for the more important references see Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds*², p. 316.

XI, 28, 4: Gow on Theor., 8, 55.

XVI, 241, 6: what are Plato and Aristotle doing in this obscenity?

Things are greatly improved when M. G. Goggin (pp. 149-201) presents an elaborate and painstaking analysis of "Rhythm in the Prose of Favorinus." Complexity and the certainty of telling results are both increased by the use of a "formula by which the

significance of . . . variants can be determined" and "the degree of possibility that they may have occurred by chance can be fixed." It would be rash for a novice to pretend to grasp such a formula, but Miss Goggin's manner of handling her material is convincing; and she is surely definitive on her subject, adducing additional arguments that favor Favorinus' authorship of *De Fortuna*, II (Or. 64 in the corpus of Dio).

Are de Groot's methods the best available? Miss Goggin believes so, and she is admirably equipped to judge. But it may be humbly submitted that all do not yet agree without reservations: see Ammon, *B. P. W.*, 1920, pp. 217 ff., 241 ff.; Bock, *Jahresber.*, CLXXXVII, p. 239; Kalinka, *ibid.*, CCLVI, p. 49; Sandbach, *C. Q.*, XXXIII, p. 194, and de Groot himself, p. 98, among others. Yet even so, with Miss Goggin's new formula to exclude chance, it does not seem likely that her work will be superseded or undone. Here is a first rate contribution to a very intricate subject, executed in a manner at once honest and objective.

C. W. Mendell (pp. 205-26) discusses "The Influence of the Epyllion on the *Aeneid*." After a brief and not quite satisfactory bow to Walter Allen's work (*T. A. P. A.*, LXXI, pp. 1 ff.), it becomes clear that the subject of the paper is really the influence of Cat. 64 on the composition of various portions of the *Aeneid*, so that the attack by implication on Allen might possibly have been omitted. One section, that on the structure of *Aen.* IX, is particularly interesting. The relative incompleteness of the book is stressed (pp. 214, 220) and it is suggested that the form will be improved if 459-472 be allowed to follow 502. "It is not impossible that both passages" (459-472, 473-502) "were written out to be later incorporated in the book and that the editors reversed Vergil's contemplated order."

There are many signs that IX has been tampered with; here it will be sufficient to mention a few interpolations in the first part of the book. We know from the fact that Quintilian VIII, 2, 14 had already *Aen.*, I, 109 in his text (*R. M.*, LXXXIV, p. 223) that interpolations were well underway in the first century after Vergil's death. Here are a handful in IX: 85, 151, 363, 550 (and of course 29, 121, 529, though one will hardly lay stress on this). Consider also 174-5, which seem inconsistent (*omnis* is the usual jargon) with 226 ff. and are perhaps merely a reworking of 161 (*muros*) and 164 (*vices*), leaving *quod cuique tuendum est* without meaning.

One may hope that it can no longer be said that "Today the majority of scholars accept much of the *Vergilian Appendix*" (p. 214) in view, e. g., of *R. M.*, XCIII, pp. 289 ff. (and for the *Culex* see especially *Gnomon*, IV, pp. 577 ff. with its masterly application of Leo's arguments).

M. E. Taylor ("The Development of the Quod Clause," pp. 229-49) produces a smooth sequence without mentioning any of the relevant literature, or indeed any literature at all. Finally, A. R. Bellinger ("Greek Coins from the Yale Numismatic Collection, II," pp. 253-65) continues his excellent work from *Yale Stud.*, XI, pp. 307 ff. in the sound and informative manner we have come to expect from him.

DOMENICO BRAGA. *Catullo e i poeti greci*. Messina-Firenze, Casa Editrice G. D'Anna, 1950. Pp. 274. (*Biblioteca di Cultura Contemporanea*, XXX.)

This study does not aim at arranging in tidy, parallel columns all the passages from Greek poetry which may possibly have influenced Catullus, directly or indirectly. Whoever wishes to pursue such a limited goal need only consult Lafaye, the standard commentaries on Catullus, and the excellent German dissertations of this century on this subject (most of which are listed in *H. S. C. P.*, LX [1951], pp. 131-6). Rather, in the case of this book one need have no concern over

How index-learning turns no student pale,
Yet holds the eel of science by the tail.

For this is an interpretative study which proposes, like Professor Havelock's *The Lyric Genius of Catullus* from a different approach, to unbare and then assess the veritable *anima Catulliana*. The author feels—and this is the purpose of his book—that the time is now ripe for soberly evaluating the Latin poet's originality by examining his adaptation of motives and stylistic techniques of his Greek predecessors. Now, he believes, we should be able to avoid the Scylla of *la reazione romantica* of the last century and the Charybdis of *l'estatica ammirazione della corrente umanistica*, and thus solidly establish Catullus' spiritual independence.

With Braga's thesis—that Catullus is most original when he makes the fullest use of tradition—we all, I suppose, are in agreement. This work, then, is the direct heir of, and indeed would have been impossible without, the masterly investigations of such scholars as Wilamowitz, Reitzenstein, Weinreich, and Hezel.

The chief Greek authors treated are Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Archilochus, Sappho, the tragedians, Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and the epigrammatists of the *Anthology*, with a natural emphasis on Sappho and Callimachus.

To begin with general criticisms, the book might well have had an initial chapter devoted to a brief, concise enumeration of the outstanding characteristics of Callimachus, Theocritus, Apollonius, and the epigrams of Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic times. Thus the somewhat nebulous term "Alexandrian" could have been avoided, and the reader could see in what respects Catullus now and then is quite unlike, say, Callimachus or Theocritus (as in the simplicity, lack of over-elaboration, and disproportions of No. 64) or in what respects he imitates a Hellenistic writer (as here and there in the tantalizing No. 6^o he is indeed Callimachean, or in his frequent dependence upon epigrams in the *Anthology* as "starting points"). Such a chapter, if detailed and down-to-earth, would have obviated much later verbiage.

Then, too, if one is to try to get at *la potenza del genio romano* from such an approach, native elements ought not to have been neglected, whether it be a matter of reckoning with Ennius (as is probably the case in No. 64, *pace* T. Frank, "The Mutual Borrowings of Catullus and Lucretius and What They Imply," *C. P.*,

XXVIII [1933], pp. 249-56) or with the Italian love of mimicry and abuse, and of realism and concreteness, or with the innate sound-effects of the Latin language.

Also, in this delicate process of subtractions, Braga surely should have treated, on the positive side, such fundamentally Catullan items as his use of images (whence drawn, used in what quantity, and of what emotional setting; see J. Svensnung, *Catulls Bildersprache*, I [Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1945: 3]) and his handling of words (see J. Van Gelder, *De Woordherhaling bij Catullus* [Den Haag, 1933]).

Lastly, in the matter of the form and nature of the epigram and the short lyric, and their gradual merging, dogmatism is dangerous. Account should have been taken of Reitzenstein's refusal to consider metre as an important matter in the case of the Catullan epigram, as well as of Wilamowitz' judgment that when Catullus set out to write a short poem, he did not check to see whether the subject and handling traditionally demanded this or that metre. In short, it should have been frankly admitted that we know very little indeed about the history of the little lyric from the fourth to the first century B. C.

To turn now to a few specific items, Homeric influence in No. 64 (pp. 8-14) has already been much better (and more fully) treated by Wheeler, whose *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry* (see chap. V) is never cited nor apparently used. As to whether the stream-simile in No. 68, 57-62 refers to the poet's tears or to the relief Allius gave, Braga is probably right in preferring the first, but not in holding that Catullus is here "trasportato dalla vivida fantasia" (p. 12); nothing, I believe, could be a more conscious (and incidentally unsuccessful) piece of "Alexandrian" imitation (as was shown by A. Tartara, *Animadversiones* [Roma, 1882, p. 36]). As for Hesiodic influence on No. 64 (pp. 14-17), we might have been reminded that Hesiod, according to Tzetzes, wrote a work on the same subject. Further, a comparison with the disjunctive Hesiodic style (the result perhaps of compilation?) might not have been fruitless. With the statement (p. 16) that Catullus' pessimism is more profound than Hesiod's, I find agreement difficult; the ending of No. 64 seems to me conventional (cf. No. 63, 91-3), and anyway Catullan pessimism worked within a totally different ambit. Braga makes an heroic essay to show that the *Parcae*-song is an attempt to imitate Pindar (pp. 17-21), but the arguments only remind me of "I told you butter wouldn't suit the works!" It may not be safe to hold with Wilkinson, *Horace and His Lyric Poetry*, p. 89, that "Horace is the first Roman whom we know to have studied Pindar," but at least, to my mind, the spirit and technical elements of the *Parcae*-song much sooner suggest the influences of Sappho, Euripides (*I. A.*, 1036 ff.), and Theocritus. The chapter on Archilochus (pp. 23-44) is well done, especially in its emphasis upon the temperamental affinity between the two poets. But Braga here and later (chap. VIII) maintains that "I modelli classici fornivano a Catullo un'invettiva impetuosa e violenta, a carattere soggettivo e con accuse personali; i modelli ellenistici una invettiva tipica, fatta di caricature umoristiche, di satire impersonali, di vivaci stoc-

cate" (p. 23). This may be so. Horace in his *Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio* (*Epist.*, I, 19, 23-4) is probably referring only to the form of the couplet. But all the same, when it comes to practical classification, one may not feel that it is at all easy, nor useful either, to draw such scholastic lines. Many a Catullan attack would rather seem to be a complex blend of Archilochean, Hellenistic, and Italian elements, as might be expected from the poet's temperament, training, and background. The chapter on Sappho is excellent—perhaps the best in the book—especially in the section on No. 51 (pp. 48-55) with its sensible, Italian refusal to consider whether the poetess sings of love or of jealousy, "quando l'uno apporta fatalmente anche l'altra." In the section on Aeschylus, caution might perhaps suggest that we consider more seriously possible influences from the early Latin tragedians. As for the lack of understanding of Sophocles at Rome, I disagree, in part at least, in the case of Horace (cf. *C.*, I, 3 and 37, and III, 5). Incidentally, we may hope that Professor Whitman in his *Sophocles* has now exploded the myth of that poet as *un artista sereno*. For those who, like myself, are interested in structural patterns in Catullus, Braga has traced in Nos. 6, 55, and 80 an interesting sequence of "fact," "doubt," and "deduction" (in dealing with *L'innamorato che tace*, pp. 130 ff.) back to the Hellenistic epigram; cf. also Horace, *C.*, I, 8. On the section on *L'eros paidikós* (pp. 136 ff.), perhaps two comments are in order: the *molliculi* of No. 16, 8 does not refer to Juventius but to Lesbia (cf. No. 16, 12 with No. 5, 7); the purely conventional character of the Juventius poems is still no more definitely proven than that of Horace's on Ligurinus. The lengthy discussion of the *Attis* (pp. 145-54) and the questioning of Wilamowitz' views (cf. *A. J. P.*, LXVIII [1947], pp. 394 ff.) seem to this reviewer sound, but on the question of Callimachean *μέλη* (p. 147), see Pfeiffer, *Call.*, p. 216. Anent the statement that "nessuno ha saputo dare una descrizione della natura così armonicamente intonata alle diverse situazioni di spirito dei personaggi" (said of the *Attis*, p. 153), cf. *Iliad*, XXIII, 212-32 and Soph., *Ajax*, 21, 217, 258, 660, and 672, and A. S. Pease, "Notes on the Pathetic Fallacy in Latin Poetry," *C. J.*, XXII (1927), pp. 645-57. *Sed satis superque.*

While this book is not epochal in Catullan studies (since it is so largely dependent upon various monographic studies of the past fifty years), the synthesis which it presents, often accompanied by original interpretations, is both interesting and valuable, written in a sound knowledge and—something of a rarity in the case of Catullus—in a good taste. As such, it is a useful supplement, or perhaps antidote, to many of the views of Lafaye.

J. P. ELDER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

C. H. ROBERTS, editor. *The Antinoopolis Papyri, Part I.* London, Egypt Exploration Society, 1950. Pp. xii + 119; 2 plates. 25s. (*Graeco-Roman Memoirs*, Vol. XXVIII.)

This volume is the first in a new series, which will contain the papyri found by John Johnson at Antinoopolis during the winter of 1913-14. A few texts discovered in these excavations have already been published separately, the most notable perhaps being one of the *Two Theocritus Papyri*, edited by Hunt and Johnson in 1930. The present volume continues the numbering of H. J. M. Milne, *Greek Shorthand Manuals*, 1934, and hence begins with no. 7. The 44 papyri which were selected for publication in it are said to be representative of the entire collection, "with the reservation that what may be styled professional texts (e. g. medical and legal) are under-represented . . . while the unpublished documents are on the whole later in date." As a consequence of their representative character, the various classes of texts published here have little in common except provenance and present problems of the most diverse and specialized character. An editor could hardly have a wider competence than Mr. Roberts, but he has very wisely consulted a large number of experts, especially in dealing with the theological and literary papyri. In the notes, e. g., to one short fragment from the New Comedy (no. 15) there are recorded suggestions made by Fraenkel, Maas, Pfeiffer, and Webster.

The volume begins with theological fragments from papyrus (nos. 7-9) or parchment codices (nos. 10-14). No. 7, two small pieces from the same leaf of a psalter, is notable chiefly for its "delicate and rounded" literary hand and early date (middle of the second century). The numerous and more substantial fragments in no. 8 are from a third century codex which contained *Proverbs*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, *Ecclesiasticus*, and possibly other books. The *Proverbs* fragments, as Roberts demonstrates, have a very considerable importance for the history of the text. They contain many readings which are either unique or not found in the LXX, and, secondly, show a tendency to agree with N-V. No. 9, part of a leaf again of *Proverbs* (third century), is of less interest, though it also tends to agree with N-V. The text of *Ezekiel* in no. 10 (fourth century) appears to be related to that of the Scheide *Ezekiel*. It would be interesting to know as regards all four fragments whether they come from a Christian or Jewish source. The editor does not consider the question, though eminently qualified to give an authoritative opinion. However, the codex form and the abbreviations in nos. 7, 9, and 10 may point to a Christian origin; for the criteria and for the remarkably slight evidences of early Christianity in Egypt see H. I. Bell, *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XXXVII (1944), pp. 185-204. The existence of the Hebrew fragments, nos. 47-50, may be noted in this connection.

The remaining theological fragments are no. 11: *St. Matthew's Gospel*, with a unique reading at xxvi, 75 (fourth century); no. 12: *II John*, the greater part of the epistle with several independent readings (third century); no. 13: *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, a finely written sheet of unusual quality and the fifth example of the Greek

text of this popular work to have been found in Egypt (fourth century); and no. 14: a Latin fragment which has since been identified as part of *Esther*, iv in the *versio antiquissima*; see J. Moreau, *La Nouvelle Clio*, III (1951), p. 398. The order of recto and verso should be reversed.

There are eight new classical fragments, the hands of which range from the late second to the fifth century. Perhaps the most interesting is no. 15, a page of a New Comedy codex. On the recto there is a recognition scene; on the verso, the beginning of a new act or play. An insert notes that another leaf of the same codex has been published by Schubart in his *Griechische Literarische Papyri*, no. 23. Very little remains of the next three pieces: no. 16, another comic fragment; no. 17, hexameter poems, the recto dealing probably with Telamon and Teucer, the verso with the rivalry between the Sirens and Muses; and no. 18, a text of unknown genre but clearly referring to the Eleusinian mysteries. No. 19 seems to be from an epitome, perhaps the author's own, of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *A. R.* (the episode of Coriolanus). The scholia on Callimachus, *Hymns*, no. 20, were included by Pfeiffer in his recent edition of that author. No. 21 is a sillybos having the tantalizing inscription Πίνδαρος ὄλος (third century). The recto of a Latin legal fragment, no. 22, has been identified by Prof. de Zulueta as treating of the edict *quod falso (?) tute* (*Dig.*, XXIII, 6) and as being possibly a passage of Ulpian, *Ad Edictum*, XII.

The fragments of extant classical authors (nos. 23-30) vary in size and importance. Nevertheless, together with the group just summarized, they give a striking impression of the great variety of literary works circulating in Antinoopolis during the late Empire and early Byzantine period. No. 23 is a leaf of the *Medea*, containing short scholia and a new reading in line 839 (*μετρίοις* instead of *μετρίας*). The fragments of the *Bacchae*, no. 24, have already been used in Dodds' edition of the play. No. 25, a leaf from Thucydides, VIII, contains several new readings (third century); a collation was furnished Powell for his revision of the O. C. T. Thucydides. No. 26, fragments of Xenophon, *Symposium*, has a two-fold interest: the hand, the closest parallel to which is found in the Herodotus fragments from Dura; and the format, the first example in Egypt of a Greek literary work written on a parchment roll. Both circumstances, Roberts concludes quite reasonably, suggest that the roll may have been imported from outside Egypt. No. 27, a complete leaf of *De Corona* (secs. 49-56, third century) is carefully studied for its bearing on the text tradition. Another parchment leaf, no. 28, contains on one side the end of Hippocrates, *Prognostic*; on the other the beginning of the *Aphorisms*. The text (third century) is remarkable for its poor orthography and numerous errors. No. 29 is in format the most impressive of the entire group. It is a fragmentary papyrus page which contained the end of *Georgic* II and the beginning of *Georgic* III (fourth century). There are a few brief scholia, and the third book is preceded by what appears to be an *argumentum*. The complete page measured at least 41 x 27.5 cm., with only 25 lines to the page. Red ink was used for the *explicit* of *Georgic* II and the first three lines of *Georgic* III. Roberts observes

that "this is the first fragment of the *Georgics* to have been found in Egypt." It might be noted, however, that the first two lines of *Georgic* IV are repeated six times as a writing exercise in *P. Tebt.*, 686. The last literary papyrus, no. 30, is a parchment scrap, containing a few lines from *Aeneid*, XII.

Sixteen Roman and Byzantine documents are published (nos. 31-46). The official documents begin with no. 31, a letter from the curator of Antinoopolis to a cosmete, reminding him to serve a monthly term of office (A. D. 347); and no. 32, a fragmentary return of *patrimonalia* (A. D. 339). No. 33 is an official account of expenditure, probably drawn up by the provincial treasurer, which covers Ptolemais and presumably Antinoopolis (A. D. 346?). The editor's remark on the *επαρχος* in line 7 is not quite clear: "hardly a prefect, who would not be referred to in so cavalier a fashion, but a military officer," with a reference to a *praepositus limitis Philarum* cited by Maspero, *Organisation militaire*. Roberts' conclusion that the official was not *praefectus Aegypti* is quite reasonable, but instead of comparing him with a sixth century *praepositus*, it is simpler to assume that he was an auxiliary officer, perhaps a *praefectus aliae* like his well-known contemporary, Flavius Abinnaeus.

The next three documents are no. 34, a court memorandum (first half of fourth century); no. 35, parts of two petitions to an otherwise unknown prefect, Flavius Fortunius, the first of which contains remnants of eight lines in Latin, possibly a citation of another official's decision (late third century); and no. 36, a petition to a curator of Antinoopolis, showing the influence of the Chancery hand (A. D. 326?).

No. 37 is a sworn declaration by two citizens of Alexandria regarding the registration fee of their son (A. D. 209-10). A few details require comment. The lacuna at the beginning of line 2, which follows *τῶν τὰ η* (*έτος*) at the end of line 1, must almost certainly have contained the names of Septimius and Caracalla, and the date thus obtained, A. D. 200-201, should be included in index III, on p. 111. Any alternative, e. g. the eighth year of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (A. D. 168-169) would be rather early for the father's ephebate. For *τῶν* date *έφηβενκότων* as part of identifications, see e. g. *P. Ryl.*, 101; *P. Tebt.*, 316; *P. Oxy.*, 477. There seems to be an error of some kind in *συμμορίας ργθ*, which follows (line 2). In the absence of a photograph one may conjecture that the figure was *ρλθ*; that in *P. Tebt.*, 316 is *ρλγ*. Further, line 3 presumably began with the name of the *συμμοριάρχης*, not immediately with *καὶ Ισιδώρα*. The fragmentary condition of the text and the absence of exact parallels make the purpose of the declaration obscure. Roberts suggests that "the parents, both Alexandrians, are removing to Alexandria with an infant son and are required to make a sworn statement that the child's birth has already been registered elsewhere." But one would assume that a child of Alexandrian parents would himself have been registered in Alexandria at birth, in order to protect his citizenship and political status and to maintain his rights in private law. The parents may have been seeking to establish the fact as a basis for immunities and privileges at Antinoopolis or wherever they happened to be. This is essen-

tially the situation in *P. Oxy.*, 477 and, presumably, *P. S. I.*, 464; cf. also A. E. R. Boak, *J. E. A.*, XIII (1927), p. 154.

No. 38, a sworn declaration by a guild of silversmiths stating the price per pound of cast and worked silver, has a particular interest because of the probable connection with Diocletian's edict *de maximis pretiis* (A. D. 301). No. 39 is a receipt for repayment by an exactor for requisitioned goods (A. D. 324). In no. 40, a widow receives a receipt for the *vestis militaris* (early fourth century). Is it possible that Isidora in no. 39 was the widow, as well as the sister of the late Silvanus?

No. 41, a fragmentary Latin military register, consists of names and consular dates in rustic capitals, with a few cursive annotations. The consulships (A. D. 206 and 207) are dates of enlistment. There is really little reason to think that it may be part of a *pridianum*. Lists of names such as this might be found in records of many kinds. The fact that *M. Aurelius* several times precedes *nomina* suggests that the text may date after the *Constitutio Antoniniana*; cf. *Yale Classical Studies*, XI (1950), p. 198, n. 123. *P. Mich.*, 429 and 447 were edited by J. E. Dunlap, not by H. A. Sanders (addenda, p. 107).

There are fewer private documents: no. 42, an acknowledgment of indebtedness (*datio in solutum*) or sale in advance involving wine (A. D. 542); no. 43, a letter from husband to wife (late third to fourth century); no. 44, a letter concerning textiles (late fourth to fifth century); no. 45, a brief note, perhaps to a steward of a large estate (sixth century); and no. 46, a building account (fourth century).

The volume concludes with four Hebrew fragments, nos. 47-50, which are edited by W. D. McHardy. The first three are from *I Kings*, *II Kings*, and *Job*; the last is not decipherable. The fragments cannot be dated.

In format and in editorial practice the volume corresponds to its predecessors in the *Graeco-Roman Memoirs*. Perhaps the only indication that it is published in a difficult period is the fact that there are only two plates. No one would question the editor's choice of the pieces to be illustrated. But possibly it might have been better to have selected the recto of no. 15 rather than the verso, since there are several lines on it for whose restoration a photograph might be useful.

Needless to say, the work of the editor is of the highest order. The present volume is all one would expect it to be from his many other contributions and is in keeping with the great tradition established for the *Memoirs* by Grenfell and Hunt. No higher praise could be given.

J. F. GILLIAM.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

SIR JOHN DAVIDSON BEAZLEY. *The Development of Attic Black-figure*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press; London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1951. Pp. xiv + 127; 49 pls. \$6.50. (*Sather Classical Lectures*, XXIV.)

In the summer of 1928 J. D. Beazley delivered a lecture before the British Academy. The text of this lecture, together with some lists of vases and a few illustrations, was published under the title *Attic Black-figure: A Sketch*, and this small volume has served ever since both as an authoritative and delightfully written introduction to black-figure vase-painting and as a work of reference for specialists.

The present book is in a way a successor to the *Sketch*, but much enlarged and brought up to date. Here we have the text of eight lectures, delivered at the University of California in the winter of 1948-9, in which the development of Attic black-figure is traced from its origins in the Geometric and Proto-Attic styles, through its great period in the sixth century B. C. and its long survival into Hellenistic times on Panathenaic amphorae. The emphasis throughout is on vase-painters, and each successive period is illustrated by the works of the principal artists active at the time. Other topics are by no means neglected, however. There is constant reference to the vases themselves and particularly to the development of the various shapes. The subjects portrayed on the vases lead the author to many interesting comments on mythology and ancient life. Chronological questions are not treated in detail, and the author continues his wise policy of avoiding hair-splitting chronological distinctions; yet the general course of development is clearly outlined, and there are enough absolute dates to chart the way. There are no lists of vases by the various painters, these being reserved for a separate book, *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters*, which, we are told in the preface, is well advanced.

The illustrations, some of them from photographs by Lady Beazley, are on collotype plates at the end of the book. They are generally of good quality and adequate size. About 80 vases and fragments are shown, some in several views, a generous selection. The choice is superlative. We have here not the standard string of pots that one is apt to find in handbooks, although old friends are by no means lacking. A number of pieces are published here for the first time, something quite unusual in a general work on vase painting. Others which had been published in obscure journals or with inadequate photographs are now made readily accessible by their publication here. Many of the old friends are seen in new views or details. Of this wealth of new or almost new material we may mention the important early Panathenaic amphora in Florence, assigned to Lydos, a fragmentary amphora in Basel by the same painter, a charming fragment by Kleitias in Moscow, a fragment by Exekias in Lund, and new details of the Nearchos kantharos and the dinos No. 606 from the Acropolis. We are also given tantalizing glimpses of a newly acquired krater by Lydos in the British Museum and of a curious late cup by the Amasis painter in Boston. Those interested in the transition from the Geometric to the Proto-Attic

style will welcome the pictures of the ovoid krater in the Earl of Elgin's collection, published here for the first time. One complaint only: the pictures of the Leyden hydria by the Antimenes painter are taken from a bad angle and are marred by huge glaring highlights. The vase, with its delightful scenes from the life of the palaestra, is justly popular; will its custodians in Leyden not favor us soon with new pictures?

A few comments on points of detail follow.

Pages 7-8; the Menelaos stand from Aegina in Berlin. The letter forms and dialect of the inscription on this stand have been identified as Aeginetan by Miss L. H. Jeffery (*J. H. S.*, LXIX [1949], p. 26). This does not necessarily mean that the vase is a local Aeginetan product. In fact it seems quite clear that no painted pottery was being made in Aegina at this time, there being no suitable beds of non-porous clay available. This has recently been reaffirmed by Wilhelm Kraiker (*Aigina, Die Vasen des 10. bis 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* [Berlin, 1951], especially pp. 11-12 and 20) and is borne out by the amount and variety of the imports. Yet we may well ask whether Aeginetans did not have some part in the manufacture of the pottery made in various centers for export to their island, particularly the nearer centers such as Athens and Corinth. If we assume that Aeginetans either owned or were employed in the shop in Attica that made the Menelaos stand, it would sufficiently account for both the Aeginetan inscription and for the fact that so many products of this shop have been found in Aegina.

On page 18, in discussing the Sophilos dinos from the Acropolis, the author writes: "The position of the Nysai, as the painter calls them, is uncertain: the heads of three women remain, two side by side, the third full-face and playing the flute: they would seem to correspond to the Muses who accompany the chariots on the François vase and who sang at the wedding; but the name Nysai, which in the plural occurs here only, points to these being attendants of Dionysos." Could it be that Sophilos really meant to write **ΜΟΥΣΑΙ** not **ΝΥΣΑΙ**? He was a poor speller as is shown, for example, by the inscriptions cited on page 19. *Nu* for *mu* is an easy slip. *Upsilon* for *omicron epsilon* is perhaps less easy to justify, but there are examples of this very same mistake on two ostraka with the name Boutalion (*ca. 485 B. C.*; Agora Excavations, Athens, unpublished). We may assume the same thing in a recently published archaic Attic inscription on which the name **Βύλος** appears where we would expect **Βούλος** (*Hesperia*, XVII [1948], pp. 141-2). I will treat this point more fully when I publish the Boutalion ostraka in *Hesperia*. The proposed emendation would allow us to interpret the figures as Muses, which is what we should expect them to be, and at the same time would rid us of a difficult word, a sort of **ἄπαξ λεγόμενον** in that this is the only instance of its use in the plural.

Page 44, line 9. The footnote reference should be 19, not 21.

Page 67: on the technique of the Munich Exekias cup. Miss Richter has recently re-examined this cup and reports that the coral-red was clearly applied *after* the black-figured decoration and the black glaze of the rim: see *B. S. A.*, XLVI (1951), p. 148.

In Plate 43, 1 we look in vain for the rock referred to on page 86. Could it be on the other side of the vase which is not illustrated?

Pages 90-1: the early Panathenaic amphora in Florence. This important vase, adequately illustrated here for the first time, is attributed "in all probability" to Lydos by comparison with that painter's Berlin oinochoe, F 1732. The same comparison was made many years ago by Milani who discusses the Florence vase briefly without illustrating it and says that the quadriga resembles that of the oinochoe Berlin F 1732 so closely that it might be said to have been drawn by the same hand (*Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica*, III [1890], pp. 210-11).

Page 107, note 43, line 2. The word "in" should not be italicized, the reference being to an article in the periodical *Archaeology*.

The references to the Burges amphora (p. 116, note 2) might have included *Cambridge Ancient History*, Volume of Plates, I, p. 287, where the best published photographs of the figured panels are to be found. There is an excellent detail of the Athena head in an article by Ashmole in *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress . . . held in London . . . 1936*, edited by J. Allan, H. Mattingly and E. S. G. Robinson (London, 1938), Plate III, 10.

The above points are of course very small ones and in no way affect the quality of the book as a whole. It is excellent, and we are grateful for a connected account of Attic black-figure from the pen of the acknowledged master of the field. We look forward to the volume of lists which will at long last put the study of black-figure on an equal footing with red-figure.

EUGENE VANDERPOOL.

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL
STUDIES, ATHENS.

PETER GOESSLER. Wilhelm Dörpfeld. Ein Leben in Dienst der Antike. Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1951. Pp. 255; 19 illus. DM. 15.60.

The author is a specialist in Greek and German prehistory. Born in 1872, he retired for political reasons in 1934 from his offices as Director of Museums and Curator of Antiquities in Stuttgart. He was a devoted pupil and friend of Dörpfeld (1853-1940). Goessler spent many months with Dörpfeld on the island of Leucas, from 1903 (p. 134) until the death of the venerated master, believing with him that they lived in Ithaca, the kingdom of the Homeric Odysseus. When Dörpfeld's eyesight failed, Goessler helped him to bring his last books to press: *Alt-Olympia* (1935) and *Alt-Athen* (I [1937], II [1939]). This collaboration with the great man led to an admiration which included acceptance of some of the theories rejected by most other scholars. This book, however, does not emphasize these theories; they are not neglected, but neither are they recommended or criticized. Goessler has done this in a big manuscript which he plans to leave with the German Archaeological Institute.

This readable book is written from a high ethical viewpoint. It

has excellent illustrations, mostly from unpublished photographs found among Dörpfeld's legacy. They show the scholar himself, his audiences in different Greek sites: Leucas, Olympia, Troy, Athens. A plan of Achaean Greece (fig. 18) and a letter with the sketch of Oropos, in the clear and harmonious handwriting of Dörpfeld (fig. 19), are welcome additions. The index of names (pp. 251-5) comprises many renowned persons.

The main goal of Goessler was to work out the great personality and many-sided scholarship of Dörpfeld. The material, therefore, is not arranged according to subject matter, but in chronological sequence in ten chapters: 1. Background, 2. Childhood, 3. Training as an Architect, 4. Excavations in Olympia (1887-1881), 5. Travels (1881), 6. Architect of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens (1882-1885), 7. Second Secretary of the Institute (1886-1887), 8. Work with Schliemann (1881-1890), 9. First Secretary of the German Institute (1887-1912), 10. Retirement (1912-1940).

The last chapter is the longest (pp. 161-249), the one before the last, the second longest (pp. 84-160). This shows the fruitfulness of Dörpfeld's mature years. The earlier chapters, however, deal with the most important discoveries and achievements of the great architect, particularly the investigations, model excavations and descriptions of the buildings in Olympia and on the Acropolis in Athens, where he helped the Greek excavators in his unselfish way. His sober weighing of evidence and his careful excavating, layer by layer, had a great and valuable influence on Schliemann, the romantic treasure hunter, whom he assisted in Troy and Tiryns. On the other hand he accepted from Schliemann his belief in Homer's poems as a historical source. (See Schliemann, *Troja* [1890]; Schuchhardt, *Schliemann's Ausgrabungen*² [1891]; Dörpfeld, *Troja* [1903].)

Another great achievement of Dörpfeld is the fundamental statement that the classical Greek theater did not have a stage. This new theory was first presented by him in 1884 and elaborated in his great book written with Reisch: *Das griechische Theater* (1896). This book is still a standard work, despite his regrettable refusal to recognize the earliest stage in the Hellenistic form, rightly described by Vitruvius. All later books on the theater, by Fiechter, Bulle, and this reviewer are, for their architectural and classical parts, dependent on Dörpfeld. In 1922 this reviewer received kind encouragement from the great man when he recommended her book, *Denkmäler zum Theaterwesen*, to her publisher for acceptance. He had planned a new edition of his book, but never found the time to do it. Goessler publishes (pp. 101-4) the Introduction to such a new edition, written in 1921—that is, twenty-five years after his theater book. In this he regrets that the reviewer, whom he quotes, and other scholars believe the now so well-known Hellenistic theater to be the one described by Vitruvius with a high stage, while he himself believes that Vitruvius speaks of the Graeco-Roman theater, that is, Greek theaters remodelled in the Roman fashion. This reviewer is convinced that all these Graeco-Roman theaters are later than Vitruvius, and that the high Hellenistic stage is the oldest and therefore understandably still imperfect stage. For the classical period, however, Dörpfeld is absolutely correct, and such presentations as that

of Aristophanes' *Frogs*, which Dörpfeld saw in 1895 in Epidaurus (p. 108), and many others in ancient orchestras bear out his theory of the stageless play in the classical period.

Dörpfeld's later years were even fuller than the earlier ones with the most diverse activities. His many lectures in Athens developed more and more into lecture tours which took him not only to Olympia and the other sites in the Peloponnes, to the islands of Corfu, Leucas-Ithaca, Crete, to Troy and Southern Italy, but in 1896 even to the United States. Here he lectured for six weeks at the most outstanding eastern universities. Shortly before this trip, the American S. J. Barrows dedicated his book, *The Isles and Shrines of Greece* (1893), to Dörpfeld with the words: "who in bringing to light the hidden treasures of the (old) world, has won the gratitude and admiration of the new" (p. 109).

The "Homeric question" more and more held Dörpfeld's interest. He spent as much time as he could on the isle of Leucas in the home which the last German Emperor had given him. When, after World War I, he had to sell it, it was given back to him by his generous American friend, Mrs. Leslie Edith Kosmopoulos (pp. 180 f.). Dörpfeld tried with all possible means to prove that Leucas was the Homeric Ithaca (pp. 115 ff.). Another theory which is not accepted by most archeologists is the Oriental, not Cretan, origin of the Mycenean civilization; and another, that the geometric "Dipylon" art was contemporary with, or even preceded, the Mycenean art. The primitive geometric art he rightly considered autochthonic, but it is by no means identical with the highly developed later Athenian geometric ware.

Dörpfeld excavated in Pergamon each fall for twelve years, 1900-1912 (pp. 145-50), following up his campaigns with good reports by himself and his collaborators in the *A. M.* His last paper on Pergamon (*A. M.*, 1928, pp. 117 ff.) deals with Strabo and the coast of Pergamon. Here he investigated, as was his practice, monumental together with literary tradition. He always tried to prove the literary tradition to be right with the help of topographical and archaeological investigations on the spot.

In 1907 Dörpfeld found three important beehive tombs in Triphylia, and with them he believed he had discovered the Homeric Pylos of Nestor (pp. 152-4). Blegen, however, later found a Mycenean palace and an archive with clay tablets in another site (*A. J. A.*, 1939, pp. 336 ff.). In the same year Dörpfeld guided the excavations at Tiryns, which were continued by his successor, Karo. Karo dedicated his *Führer durch Tiryns* (1934) to Dörpfeld. In 1911-1914 Dörpfeld led the excavations of the archaic temple of Corfu, which were financed by the last German Emperor (pp. 158, 161-4). Wilhelm II became an admirer and pupil of Dörpfeld, and Dörpfeld remained loyal to his "Patron" (Gönner), as he called him on a postal card written in 1922 from Doorn to the reviewer. The Emperor called Dörpfeld his true friend and teacher in his last tribute on a wreath at Dörpfeld's funeral (p. 246).

In 1914, shortly before the outbreak of World War I, Dörpfeld wrote an article praising the work of North American archaeologists in Greece, at Argos, Sicyon, Corinth, Crete, Cyrene, Sardes, Nippur, and on the Acropolis (p. 169). The war prevented its publication.

Goessler emphasizes in all parts of his book the wonderful character of Dörpfeld: true piety, pure harmony, inner noble dignity radiated from him like a fluidum affecting his surroundings (p. 109). Among his students were not only great German scholars like Wilamowitz (pp. 91 f.) and Diels (p. 132), but many well known American, French, British, Italian, and Greek scholars. He was, however, helpful and patient even with young and inexperienced, inquisitive scholars, like this reviewer. She met him first in 1909 at one of his courses for fellows of the Institute in Pergamon. He took special care of the first female fellow who otherwise might have suffered from the distrust of the younger male members of the group.

Among these young fellows was Gerhart Rodenwaldt, who later, as president of the German Archaeological Institute, on the occasion of Dörpfeld's seventieth birthday, gave perhaps the best characterization of the man and his work, in an address and a speech quoted by Goessler (pp. 187 f.). After enumerating the works in Olympia, Hissarlik, Tiryns, Athens, Pergamon, Leucas, Coreyra, he calls him "an example for young scholars, giving information and helpful advice generously, many-sided inspiration, even where he compelled opposition, cheerful in deeds and conflicts, and unforgettable to anyone who has been fortunate enough to look into his shining eyes." "There is no classical scholar in the whole world who is not immediately your pupil. There is no field of our science, in which clarifying rays have not fallen as a result of your researches. If the effect of the content of your research could still be surpassed, it would be through the ethos of a scholar striving unceasingly for truth, which charms all your students and forces them into your influence. Wherever you stand in the battle for the passing on of new ideas, you lead the adversary, through the warmth of your struggle for knowledge, to a height where all strive together" (translation by the reviewer).

MARGARETE BIEBER.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

A. ERNOUT and A. MEILLET. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots.* Troisième édition, revue, corrigée et augmentée d'un index. Paris, Klincksieck, 1951. Pp. xxiv + 1385.

Latinists are peculiarly fortunate in having at their disposal two etymological dictionaries, both of the highest quality, but so different in plan that they supplement rather than duplicate one another. The greater part of Walde's *Latinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, the chief repository of etymological comparison between Latin and its sister-languages, has already appeared in its third edition, as revised by J. B. Hofmann. The dictionary of Meillet and Ernout, of which the first edition appeared in 1932 and the second in 1939, has also now appeared in its third edition. In this outstandingly excellent work the emphasis is on the history of the words and word-families within Latin itself. There is no funda-

mental change in plan or doctrine between the third and the earlier editions. At the end of each heading the etymology considered most probable is given, but there is little discussion of rejected views, and often it is frankly admitted that a word has no etymology of which we can be reasonably certain. But these remarks are not intended to create the impression that the book has not been thoroughly revised; an examination of it will soon show that the innovations briefly outlined on pages xix-xx have been carried out in detail in the body of the work. These innovations include in part the addition of words in Celtic and Germanic languages borrowed from Latin.

Ernout has made generous use of publications which have appeared during the decade since 1939, or at least too late to be utilized in preparing the second edition. A list of such works, in addition to those mentioned in the bibliography, would include Axelson's *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund, 1945; cited p. 913 under *plōrō*, 974 under *quamquam*, 1164 under *suāvis*); H. Pedersen, *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen* (Copenhagen, 1938; cited p. 833 under *ōs*); Westrup, *Formes antiques du mariage dans l'ancien droit romain* (Copenhagen, 1943; cited p. 633 under *liberī*). Benveniste's *Origine de la formation des noms en indo-européen*, which appeared in 1935 and was cited several times in the second edition, has been further used in the preparation of the third. References to journal literature are of course too numerous even to mention here.

A number of new Hittite and Tocharian etyma have been introduced: Hitt. *daššuš* p. 303 under *dēnsus*, *ešyaš* p. 359 under *erūs*, *pát* p. 576 under *ipse*, *maklant-* p. 669 under *macer*, *mēhur* p. 714 under *mētior*, *hekur-* p. 811 under *ocris*, *ariya-* p. 832 under *ōrō*, *aš* and *iššaš* p. 833 under *ōs*, *huwant-* p. 1275 under *ventus*; Toch. *klautso* p. 230 under *clueō*, *lukšanu* p. 666 under *lūc-/lūc-*. Some words of Greek origin not included in the earlier editions have been added, although naturally there is no clear criterion by which to determine whether a foreign word was sufficiently naturalized to deserve inclusion in a Latin etymological dictionary. The IE etyma of Greek loans like *ancora* < *ἄγκυρα*, *āēr* < *ἀήρ*, *hōra* < *ὥρα* are not given, but the absence of such etyma is perhaps more keenly felt in the case of Celtic words, whose origin is less likely to be already known to classical philologists: the connection of *gaesum* with Irish *gae*, OHG *gēr*, Gk. *χαῖος*, Skt. *hēśah*, is indeed pointed out, but we have no such data for *alauda*, *carrus*, *essedum*.

The addition of words borrowed from Latin by Celtic and Germanic languages is another matter. Such borrowings have been added to the Romance forms already cited in the earlier editions. The Celtic material is based on the works of Loth, Vendryes, and Pedersen, and the Germanic on that of Kluge.

The brief remarks on scattered points of detail which make up the remainder of this review mostly pertain to matters in which the third edition differs from the two earlier editions. Ed. 3 gives for *inula* an earlier attestation (Luer.) than edd. 1 and 2 (Hor., Plin.). *arferia* is brought into connection with Umb. *ařfertur* in ed. 3. For *cacula* Etruscan origin is suggested. On pp. 146-7, 148,

it is suggested that *cadō* and *caedō* are in some way connected: although they do not show an ablaut-correspondence, I believe the idea worth investigating in view of the suppletive relationship and the possible parallel in *laedō: lassus*. The article on *cista* has been considerably enlarged and includes loans in Celtic, Germanic, and even Finnish. On *crocodilus* the article is longer than in ed. 2, while ed. 1 did not list the word at all. The articles on *deus*, *diēs*, *dīus* have undergone extremely little revision, and Grace Sturtevant Hopkins' dissertation, *Indo-European *deiws and Related Words* (Philadelphia, 1932), seems not to have been taken into account. For *elementum* Etruscan origin is suggested. Under *grātulābundus* is added to the derivatives previously listed, and on p. 520 *co-, prō-, subhērēs* are added to the derivatives of *hērēs*. For *industria* the revision is thorough, and there is now no reference to Hesych. δεύκει· φροντίζει, while the popular etymology connecting *industrius* with *struere* is treated with some favor. The articles on *Lupercus*, *lupus*, *lūstrum* have been considerably expanded. For *mare* the idea of connection with Skt. *maryādā* is no longer maintained. The article on *paelex* is much expanded, and, on the basis of Avestan and Irish etyma, borrowing of Hebrew *pilegeš* before the breaking-up of IE unity is suggested (after Niedermann, *Vox Rom.*, 1940, p. 186). For both *Palātium* and *palātum* derivation from Etr. *falad* 'sky' is suggested. The articles on *pāpāver* and 2. *pūbēs* are considerably expanded; so also on *religiō*, but whereas edd. 1 and 2 preferred connection with *religāre* to Cicero's (N.D., II, 28, 72) connection with *religere*, ed. 3 is more uncertain. The article on *sulpur* has been expanded. For *torqueō* connection with *τρέπω* is suggested, as also in ed. 2; the Latin form must be an iterative of the same type as *mordeō*, *tondeō*, related to *τρέπω* as *spondeō*: *σπένδω*. For *vehemēns* he suggests here and in ed. 2 the presence of the suffix *-mēns*, corresponding to Indo-Iranian *-mant-*. His mention of *prehendō* in this connection as possibly graphic for *prendō* is curious, since he does not so treat it in the article under the heading *praehendō*. *vēscus*, which in the earlier editions was treated briefly under *vescor*, now has a half-page article.

Errors, which are not particularly numerous in view of the nature of the work, include the following: on p. xxii the date of the second edition of Buck's *Oscan-Umbrian Grammar* should read 1928 instead of 1938. On p. 55 under *anās* the citation r. *ūtva* is apparently meant for s. *ūtva*. On p. 70 under *apis* read *italo-celtique* for *indo-celtique*; the error is carried over from ed. 2. On p. 85 at the beginning of the article on *arō* read *puis plus* for *plus plus*. On p. 108 under *austērus*, in place of *avec Sénèque et Pline* read *avant Sénèque et Pline*. *buttubatta* in this and in the second edition is out of alphabetical order. On p. 260 the article by Thurneysen mentioned under *coruscus* is in *G. G. A.*, 1907, p. 806. On p. 356, bottom, for *īkkos* read *īkkos*. On p. 512, fifteen lines from the bottom, for *tur-īēi* read *tur-ēti*. On p. 580, under *ita*, the Skt. form cited as *ita* should be *iti*. On p. 677 under *malum* the Saturnian verse cited as *dabunt Metelli malum Naevio poetae* should be rearranged to read *dabunt malum Metelli Naevio poetae*: important, since this is the stock example of the verse-form; ed. 1 had the correct reading. On p.

1093, at the end of the article on *serpō*, for *εἰρπνσα* read *εἰρπνσα*. On p. 1141, middle, for *Lucrece*, 6, 557, read 6, 537. On p. 1154, bottom, for *ἔστηκα . . . ἔσταμεν* read *ἔστηκα . . . ἔσταμεν*. On p. 1298, bottom, for *nevadidēti* read *nenavidēti*, and on p. 1299, eighteen lines from the top, for *vǔdova* read *vǐdova*.

JAMES W. POULTNEY.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BRUNO SNELL. *Der Aufbau der Sprache*. Hamburg, Claassen Verlag, 1952. Pp. 221. 14.50 M.

Classical philologists, even the philosophers among them, have a curious aversion to any understanding of the stuff of which both literature and philosophy are made. Snell appears to be the exception. True, the brilliant exploits of nineteenth century "Sprachwissenschaft" were in historical and comparative exploration, and left older philosophical speculation untouched. But the half-century just ended has had much to say, both new and stimulating, some of it likely to be accepted as true, about that major mundane mystery, language. Structural analysis, the logical syntax of language that is largely the work of the Vienna circle, Bertrand Russell's speculations about language in his *Human Knowledge*, the discoveries made by Elliot-Smith on the evolution of the human brain and the part which it played in the evolution of language itself, above all the mathematical theory of communication—none of this appears in Snell's book, which has a Rip van Winkle flavor about it. There are occasional allusions to Karl Buehler's *Sprachtheorie* (now nearly twenty years old), and to some other psychological theorizing. But critical work such as Holloway's *Language and Intelligence*, which makes mincemeat of behaviorism, or the collection of *Essays on Logic and Language* edited by Flew, both published in 1951, represent new schools of thought which appear not to have touched Classical scholars. Modern "information theory" has thrown a flood of light on the nature and operation of linguistic symbolism—the process of encoding and decoding whereby the "idea" is matched (this is a neural and cerebral function) with the overt symbol or word (itself a muscular affair) is seen to be most intimately concerned with the preservation of equilibrium that has been put by Shannon and Mandelbrot into mathematical terms.

Accordingly the analysis of discourse, poetic (to which Snell's chapter 11 is devoted, epic, lyric, and dramatic) or philosophic (Snell, chapter 12) is likely within a decade or two to be put on a very different footing from Snell's traditional treatment—good, careful, and thoughtful so far as it goes, with here and there an acute and original observation, but none of it epoch-making. The same criticisms must be brought against his discussion of speech-sounds, the word and sentence, word-classes and inflexions, semantic shifts and the like, all of which is trite in substance, if renewed now and again by novelty in illustration.

But if Snell is at his best in literary criticism (pp. 186 ff.), still it remains subjective, as it must if it follows the traditional lines, along which with most philologists it degenerates into a mere empty exchange of opinions. The new knowledge tends to show that what gives a piece of writing freshness and character is the demand, almost the disturbance, which it makes in coding—it gives, as we say, to think. It also tends to show that continuity derives from a sequence of nervous impulses, which we know to be discrete—just as in successive exposures of cinematographic representations. If the discrete elements in the sequence are disjointed or trite interest flags, the pro-presentation (to substitute that term for Buehler's "re-presentation") is flat, there is no stimulus. Trouble arises, even on a linguistic level, if incongruent patterns are superimposed one upon another. That is why James Joyce's writing is vexatious; only a wilful reader will attempt to cope with its wilfulness, and wilfulness is a mark of bad character, on a literary level, as well as in other walks of life.

It is sheer guesswork, and poor guesswork at that, to suppose (p. 12) that simple linguistic forms are historically older, or original; indeed two pages below (14) Snell himself seems to repudiate that suggestion. Nor (pp. 18, 22) is any light whatever to be thrown on human verbal communication by noises made by animals. The factor of convention is wholly lacking—dogs do not bark in German in Germany, and in French in France. Snell uses (p. 40) the technical term "phoneme," but I doubt whether he understands what it involves. Many linguists now attach greater importance to "allophones"—speech is certainly not perceived as a sequence of such brief events as phonemes. As for utterances like *ksch!* used to scare poultry out of the garden (p. 41, cf. *sch* p. 53, or English *shoo*), these are strictly extra-linguistic. I do not see how *m* and *n* can be scientifically called "zentripetal, als ich-bezogen," or *p-b*, *t-d* "als du-bezogen, und demonstrativ," a notion apparently borrowed from Cassirer, who wrote, among some good things, a lot of nonsense about language, which he little understood. The very question of priority of noun, verb, or adjective (p. 59) is idle, and not deserving of serious consideration. Then, what (p. 66) is a sentence? It is, in any given utterance, a maximum syntactic construct. This definition, which is what I teach my students, has never been bettered; Carnap's assertion that any sentence may be prolonged by the addition of the words "and the moon is round" is a philosopher's trivial quibble, not sustained by usage or analysis. It is distressing, therefore, to find repeated once more (p. 77) the false statement that the heart of a sentence consists in subject and predicate: a sentence is not necessarily a matter of logical predication at all.

The three persons of grammar ($\pi\tau\sigma\omega\pi\alpha$) indicate relative position in the drama of life, exactly as on the stage. Etymologically the personal pronouns are demonstrative—here, there, over yonder (even off stage). There is no drama, but only an *ego*-narrative, or a dialogue, with fewer than three; three serve all the needs of discourse, more are not necessary.

On p. 209 Snell seems to regard $\beta'ios$ and $\beta\acute{io}s$ as homonyms; this

is not so, for accent is a phoneme too, albeit suprasegmental. A real problem is the decoding of spoken *right*, *wright*, and *write*, of *rank* "series" and *rank* "offensive," to give examples from English. This is a matter of linguistic determinacy, which can be calculated. On p. 220 for *Apperçu* read *Aperçu*.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

T. B. L. WEBSTER. Greek Terracottas. The King Penguin Books, 1950. Pp. 36; 54 pls.

This is another of the books in the Penguin series on Greek things. The author is the well-known Professor Webster of Manchester who combines an unusual knowledge of both literature and art as shown by his books and articles. Here, too, he gives a most attractive and readable but scholarly account of Greek terracottas from the seventh century through Hellenistic times. It is the best treatment of the subject in twenty-four pages and the many illustrations are excellent and representative. He compares the terracottas with Homer, Callinus, Hippoanax, Sappho, Alcaeus, Aeschylus, Pindar, Plato, Aristophanes, and especially Menander. Perhaps there is an undue number of actors (some eight, 26-33) exclusive of two masks in Boston. It is said that "this is the first book in English for the last fifty years to deal with Greek terracottas." How about C. A. Hutton's *Greek Terracotta Statuettes*, 1899; M. B. Huish, *Greek Terra-cotta Statuettes*, 1900; H. B. Walters, *Catalogue of Terracottas in the British Museum*, 1903; and my two volumes on the *Terracottas of Olynthus (Excavations at Olynthus, IV and VII; vol. XIV, 1952, also deals with terracottas)*; also Miss Burr (Mrs. Homer Thompson), *Terra-Cottas from Myrina*, 1934. It is surprising that as great a scholar as Webster, a friend with whom I have had much correspondence, does not know the Olynthus publications. Evidently Miss Bieber has told him something about Olynthus, for on p. 22 he speaks of replicas of two terracotta actors found at Olynthus and on p. 35, he dates nos. 27-33 before 348 B. C., whereas Miss Bieber dated them up to 312 B. C. I am pleased that he accepts my dating without having read *Olynthus X*, pp. 6-7, n. 31. At least five (not two) of the actor types occur at Olynthus. Miss Bieber accepts my dating in *C. W.*, XXXV (1941), p. 64.

But this is a charming book by one of England's greatest classical scholars. Let me quote his conclusion: "The history of terracotta statuettes is therefore part of the history of sculpture. The artist also has to make his living and his statuettes must suit the various purposes for which the buyer can use them; they are cheap and the buyer is the ordinary citizen; terracottas therefore tell a good deal about the ordinary Greek at various times, what he thought about the gods, what he thought about death, what things he thought pleasant to look at, and what amusing. They are also works of art. They are not unique in the sense that a cup by Euphroniros or a poem by Sappho is unique, because they could be produced in large numbers from moulds, but the moulds were made by good, and some-

times very good, artists and the statuettes were finished and painted so that they became alive and exciting. The best of those that have survived retain their immediate and direct appeal today."

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI.

C. H. V. SUTHERLAND. *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy*, 31 B. C.-A. D. 68. London, Methuen, 1951. Pp. xi + 220; 17 collotype plates. 21 s.

The only thing that really needs to be said about this book is that everyone interested in the period ought to read it. The author is making available to historians a class of evidence that they can hardly be expected to cope with without guidance because its bulk is so very large. Dr. Sutherland is the best of guides because to a sound historical sense and an intimate acquaintance with the coinage he adds an ability to write English so good that reading the book is as much a pleasure as it is a profit. I have no intention of summarizing it; it needs neither explanation nor supplement. It may be remarked, however, that the appendices, written for the numismatist rather than for the general reader, will be heartily welcomed by specialists. Not the least of their merits is in reminding us how much is still conjectural in what we are accustomed to think of as a well-known period.

ALFRED R. BELLINGER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all pertaining to the classical field are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Actes du premier Congrès de la Fédération internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques à Paris, 28 Août—2 Septembre 1950. Ouvrage publié sous les auspices de la Fédération internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques et honoré, sur la recommandation du Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines, d'une subvention de l'UNESCO. Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1951. Pp. 405.

Atzert (C.) and Ax (W.). M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia, Fasc. 48. De Officiis (3rd ed.). De Virtutibus (2nd ed.). Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1949. Pp. xlvi + 189. \$3.07. (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*.)

Bérard (Jean), Goube (Henri), Langumier (René). Homère, Odyssée, Chants I, V-VII, IX-XII, XIV, XXI-XXIII. Paris, *Hachette*, 1952. Pp. iii + 476; 3 maps; 42 figs. (*Classiques Hachette*.)

Bousquet (Jean). Fouilles de Delphes, tome II: Topographie et architecture. Le trésor de Cyrène. Paris, *E. de Boccard*, 1952. Pp. 112; folio of LI plates. (*École français d'Athènes*.)

Campbell (Alistair), ed. Frithegodi Monachi Breuiloquium Vitae Beati Wilfredi et Wulfstani Cantoris Narratio Metrica de Sancto Swithuno. Zürich, *Thesaurus Mundi*, 1950 (?). Pp. 183. \$3.00.

- Castorina (Emanuele). *L'atticismo nell'evoluzione del pensiero di Cicerone*. Catania, *Cav. Niccolò Giannotta*, 1952. Pp. 302.
- Chrimes (K. M. T.). *Ancient Sparta. A Re-examination of the Evidence*. New York, *Philosophical Library*; Great Britain, *Aberdeen Univ. Press*, 1952. Pp. xv + 527; 10 pls. \$8.75.
- Cloché (Paul). *Thèbes de Béotie, des origines à la conquête romaine*. *Publications de Facultés Universitaires de Namur*, 1952. Pp. 289. 150 fr. belges. (*Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres*, Fasc. 13.)
- Cooper (Charles Gordon). *An Introduction to the Latin Hexameter*. Melbourne, *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.*, 1952. Pp. x + 70. 7 s. 6 d.
- Cottrell (Leonard). *The Lost Pharaohs. The Romance of Egyptian Archaeology*. New York, *Philosophical Library*, 1951. Pp. 256; 51 pls. \$6.00.
- Crane (R. S.), ed. *Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern*. Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1952. Pp. 647. \$6.00.
- Croon (Joh. H.). *The Herdsman of the Dead. Studies on some Cults, Myths and Legends of the Ancient Greek Colonization-area*. Utrecht, *Boekhandel H. de Vroede*, 1950. Pp. 112.
- Crosby (H. Lamar). *Dio Chrysostom, Vol. V: Discourses LXI-LXXX*. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*; London, *William Heinemann Ltd.*, 1951. Pp. 341 + fragments, letters, testimony, and index. \$3.00. (*Loeb Classical Library*.)
- David (M.) and van Groningen (B. A.). *Papyrological Primer*, Third Edition. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*, 1952. Pp. x + 179; 6 facsimiles; 2 maps. 14.75 guilders.
- Davis (Simon). *Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt: Greek, Egyptian, Hebrew, Roman*. New York, *Philosophical Library*, 1952. Pp. xiii + 176. \$4.50.
- Diehl (Ernst). *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, Fasc. 3: *Iamborum Scriptores. Editio Tertia*. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1952. Pp. vi + 162. 5.60 DM.
- Diller (Aubrey). *The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers*. *American Philological Association* (to be ordered through Lancaster Press, Inc., Lancaster, Pa. and B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., Oxford), 1952. Pp. x + 200; 3 pls.; 1 map. \$5.00. (*Philological Monographs*, No. XIV.)
- Diringer (David). *The Alphabet: A Key to the History of Mankind*. Second and Revised Edition. New York, *Philosophical Library*, 1951. Pp. 607. \$12.00.
- Dornseiff (Franz). *Verschmähtes zu Vergil, Horaz und Properz*. Berlin, *Akademie-Verlag*, 1951. Pp. 108. 11.50 DM. (*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Band 97, Heft 6.)
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers, Number Five. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1950. Pp. ix + 279. \$7.50.
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers, Number Six. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1951. Pp. 251. \$7.50.
- Ehrenberg (Victor). *The People of Aristophanes. A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1951. Pp. xx + 417; 19 pls. \$5.00.
- Ernout (Alfred) and Thomas (François). *Syntaxe Latine*. Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1951. Pp. xvi + 416. (*Nouvelle Collection à l'Usage des Classes*, XXXVIII.)
- Excavations (The) at Dura Europos. *Preliminary Report of the Ninth Season of Work, 1935-36, Part III: The Palace of the Dux Ripae and the Dolicheneum*. New Haven, *Yale Univ. Press*; London, *Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford Univ. Press*, 1952. Pp. xvi + 134; 24 pls.; 11 text figs. \$5.00.

Galiano (Manuel Fernandez). *Pseudo-Jenofonte, La Republica de los Atenienses. Texto, traducción y notas. Introducción de Manuel Cardenal de Iracheta.* Madrid, *Instituto de Estudios Políticos*, 1951. Pp. xvi + 20 (Greek facing Spanish).

Gonda (J.). *Ancient-Indian ojas, Latin *augos and the Indo-European nouns in -es/-os.* Utrecht, *N. V. A. Ossthoek's Uitgevers Mij*, 1952. Pp. 83.

Gordon (Arthur E.). *Quintus Veranius Consul A. D. 49. A study based upon his recently identified sepulchral inscription.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, *Univ. of California Press*, 1952. Pp. viii + 231-352; pls. 7-13. \$1.75. (*Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Archaeology*, II, no. 5.)

Granero (E. Ignacio). *Aristoteles, El arte de la retórica, Tomo I. Texto griego y traducción con notas y comentarios.* Mendoza, 1951. Pp. 201. (*Universidad nacional de Cuyo, Facultad de filosofía y letras, Instituto de lenguas y literaturas clásicas*.)

Grant (Michael). *Ancient History.* London, *Methuen and Co., Ltd.*, 1952. Pp. 247. 7 s. 6 d. (*Home Study Books*, 15.)

Grant (Robert M.). *Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought.* Amsterdam, *North-Holland Publishing Company*, 1952. Pp. viii + 293; frontispiece. \$4.50.

Günterich (Rudolph). *Die Küstenbeschreibung in der griechischen Literatur.* Münster, *Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1950. Pp. 32; map. (*Orbis Antiquus*, Heft 4.)

Haas (Hans). *Cornelius Tacitus, Germania. Text und Namenverzeichnis.* Einleitung von Karl Meister, mit einer Karte von Germanien um die Wende des 1-2 Jh. n. Ch. von Richard von Kienle. Heidelberg, *F. H. Kerle Verlag*, 1952. Pp. 64. 1.80 DM. (*Heidelberger Texte, Lateinische Reihe*, 23.)

Handford (S. A.) *Caesar, Gallic War, Books II and III.* London, *Methuen and Co., Ltd.*, 1952. Pp. ix + 107; 1 illus.; 2 maps. 5 s. 6 d.; 4 s. 6 d. without vocabulary.

Hansson (Nils). *Textkritisches zu Juvencus, mit vollständigem Index Verborum.* Lund, *G. W. K. Gleerup*, 1950. Pp. 169.

Herbig (Reinhard). *Zur Bedeutung von Etruskisch Fler.* Heidelberg, *Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag*, 1950. Pp. 31; 5 pls. 4.80 DM. (*Sitzb. der Heidelberger Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1950, Abh. 1.)

Herrmann (Léon). *L'âge d'argent doré.* Paris, *Presses Universitaires de France*, 1951. Pp. 169. 700 fr. (*Université Libre de Bruxelles, Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres*.)

Hoeg (Carsten) and Zuntz (Günther). *Prophetologium, Fasc. 3: Lectiones Hebdomadarum 3^{ae} et 4^{ae} Quadragesimae.* Hauniae, *Einar Munksgaards Forlag*, 1952. (*Union Académique Internationale, Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, Lectionaria*, Vol. I.)

Hohl (Ernst). *Die Siegesfeiern des Tiberius und das Datum der Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald.* Berlin, *Akademie Verlag*, 1952. Pp. 24. (*Sitzb. der deutschen Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Klasse für Gesellschaftswissenschaften, 1952, No. 1.)

Hohl (Ernst). *Um Arminius. Biographie oder Legende?* Berlin, *Akademie-Verlag*, 1951. Pp. 27. (*Sitzb. der deutschen Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Klasse für Gesellschaftswissenschaften, 1951, No. 1.)

Hope (Richard). *Aristotle's Metaphysics newly translated as a postscript to natural science with an analytical index of technical terms.* New York, *Columbia Univ. Press*, 1952. Pp. xviii + 394. \$5.00.

Irigoin (Jean). *Histoire du texte de Pindare.* Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1952. Pp. xiv + 465. 1800 fr. (*Études et Commentaires*, XIII.)

Irvine (A. L.). *Tacitus, Histories, Books I and II.* London, *Methuen and Co., Ltd.*, 1952. Pp. vi + 196; 3 maps. 8 s.; 7 s. 6 d. without vocabulary.

Jones (A. H. M.). *The Athens of Demosthenes. An Inaugural Lecture delivered in Cambridge on 23 January 1952.* New York, *Cambridge Univ. Press*, 1952. Pp. 29. \$0.50.

Jones (W. H. S.). *Pliny, Natural History, Vol. VI: Books XX-XXIII.* Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*; London, *William Heinemann, Ltd.*, 1951. Pp. xxv + 531. \$3.00. (*Loeb Classical Library.*)

Kasten (H.) and Reis (P.). *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia, Fasc. 19: Oratio Pro Sulla* (2nd ed.), *Oratio Pro Archia Poeta* (2nd ed.). Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1949. Pp. x + 62. \$1.00. (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.*)

Kirby (Thomas A.) and Woolf (Henry Bosley), eds. *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies.* Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1950. Pp. 382. \$7.50.

Klingner (Fridericus). *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, 2nd ed. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1950. Pp. xxii + 378. \$3.75. (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.*)

Lacombrade (Christian). *Le discours sur la royauté de Synésios de Cyrène à l'empereur Arcadios.* Traduction nouvelle avec introduction, notes et commentaire. Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1951. Pp. 157. 500 fr.

Lacombrade (Christian). *Synésios de Cyrène, Hellène et Chrétien.* Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1951. Pp. 318. 1200 fr.

Lammert (Fr.). *Claudii Ptolemaei Opera Quae Exstant Omnia, Vol. III, 2: De Iudicandi Facultate et Animi Principatu. Pseudo-Ptolemaei Fructus sive Centiloquium* (ed. AE. Boer). Accedunt indices verborum totius voluminis. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1952. Pp. xvi + 120. 6 DM. (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.*)

Lejeune (Michel). *La posición del latín en el dominio indoeuropeo.* Traducción y prólogo de Carlos Alberto Ronchi March. Buenos Aires, *Imprenta y casa editora "Coni,"* 1949. Pp. xi + 63. (*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de filosofía y letras, Instituto de filología, sección clásica, Serie B, Vol. III.*)

Lenchantin de Gubernatis (Maximus). *Cornelii Taciti De Vita Iulii Agricolae Liber.* Turin, *G. B. Paravia & Co.*, 1949. Pp. xxxii + 46. (*Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.*)

Lenkeith (Nancy). *Dante and the Legend of Rome.* London, *The Warburg Institute, Univ. of London*, 1952. Pp. x + 184; 2 pls. 25 s. (*Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Supplement II.*)

McKinlay (Arthur Patch). *Aratoris Subdiaconi De Actibus Apostolorum.* Vienna, *Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky*, 1951. Pp. lxiv + 363. (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, LXXII.*)

Maddalena (Antonio). *Thucydidis Historiarum Liber Primus, Tomus III.* Testo critico e commento con traduzione e indici. Firenze, *La Nuova Italia Editrice*, 1952. Pp. 179.

Manni (Eugenio). *Introduzione allo studio della storia greca e romana.* Palumbo, 1952. Pp. 238.

Manni (Eugenio). *Trebellio Pollione. Le vite di Valeriano e di Gallieno.* Palumbo, 1951. Pp. 74.

Marache (René). *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du gout archaïsant au II^e siècle de notre ère.* Rennes, *Plihon Editeur*, 1952. Pp. 359.

Meissner (Bernhard). *Mythisches und Rationales in der Psychologie der euripideischen Tragödie.* Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der philosophischen Fakultät der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen. Göttingen, 1951. Pp. vii + 179.

Nilsson (Martin P.). *Opuscula Selecta, linguis anglica, francogallica, germanica conscripta*, Vol. II. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup, 1952. Pp. viii + 457-1083. (*Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen. Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae*, II: 2.)

Nilsson (Nils-Ola). *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz*. Uppsala, Almqvist and Wiksell's Boktryckeri AB, 1952. Pp. viii + 220. 18 Kr. (*Studia Latina Hormiensia*, I.)

Parsons (Edward Alexander). *The Alexandrian Library, Glory of the Hellenic World. Its Rise, Antiquities, and Destinations*. Amsterdam, London, New York, *The Elsevier Press*, 1952. Pp. xii + 468; frontispiece, plates, 2 maps. \$7.50.

Perosa (Alessandro). *Michaelis Marulli Carmina*. Zürich, *Thesaurus Mundi*, 1952. Pp. xliv + 261. \$3.00.

Perrochat (Paul). *Pétrone, Le Festin de Trimalcion. Commentaire exégétique et critique*. Deuxième édition revue et corrigée. Paris, *Presses Universitaires de France*, 1952. Pp. xxii + 147. 700 fr. (*Université de Grenoble, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres*.)

Pistorius (Philippus Villiers). *Plotinus and Neoplatonism. An introductory Study*. Cambridge, *Bowes and Bowes*, 1952. Pp. 175. 21 s.

Pohlenz (M.). *Plutarchi Moralia*, Vol. VI, fasc. 2. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1952. Pp. xii + 224. 9 DM. (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*.)

Polacco (Luigi). *Tuscanicae Dispositiones: Problemi di architettura dell'Italia protoromana*. Padua, *Casa Editrice Antonio Milani*, 1952. Pp. 158. 1500 lire. (*Università di Padova, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia*, XXVII.)

Pralle (Ludwig). *Die Wiederentdeckung des Tacitus*. Fulda, *Verlag Parzeller and Co.*, 1952. Pp. 108. (*Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Diözese Fulda*, XVII.)

Rackham (H.). *Pliny, Natural History*, Vol. IX: *Libri XXXIII-XXXV*. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*; London, *William Heinemann, Ltd.*, 1952. Pp. viii + 421. \$3.00. (*Loeb Classical Library*.)

Raeder (Hans). *Platoniske Stadier*. København, *I Kommission hos Ejnar Munksgaard*, 1950. Pp. 29. 2.00 Dann. fr. (*Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Filosofiske Meddelelser*, Bind II, Nr. 5.)

Raucq (E.). *Bijdrage tot de Studie van de Morphologie van het Indo-Europeanisch Verb*. Bruges, *Uitgeverij "De Tempel"*, 1947. Pp. 199.

Reynolds (J. M.) and Perkins (J. B. Ward) in collaboration with Salvatore Aurigemma, Renato Bartoccini, Giacomo Caputo, Richard Goodehild, Pietro Romanelli. *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*. Rome, *The British School at Rome*, 1952. Pp. vii + 286; 11 pls.; 9 maps; 17 text figs. £3.

Sherman (Charles L.). *Diodorus of Sicily. With an English Translation*. Vol. VII: Books XV-20-XVI. 65. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*; London, *William Heinemann, Ltd.*, 1952. Pp. 431; 2 maps. \$3.00. (*Loeb Classical Library*.)

Smith (H. R. W.). *Problems Historical and Numismatic in the Reign of Augustus*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, *Univ. of California Press*, 1951. Pp. x + 133-230; 6 pls.; 2 text figs. \$1.00. (*Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Archaeology*, II, no. 4.)

Thylander (Hilding). *Inscriptions du Port d'Ostie*. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup, 1951-52. Pp. xxiv + 568; CXXV pls.; VI plans. (*Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae*, IV, 1 and 2.)

Tomsin (Alfred). *Étude sur le Commentaire Virgilien d'Aemilius Asper*. Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1952. Pp. 160. (*Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège*, CXXV.)